

The JOURNAL of

SOUTHERN HISTORY

VOL. V

NOVEMBER, 1939

No. 4



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V

NOVEMBER, 1939

NUMBER 4

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

JOHN D. BARNHART
Louisiana State University

WILLIAM O. LYNCH
Indiana University

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
University of Texas

PHILIP DAVIDSON
Agnes Scott College

AVERY O. CRAVEN
University of Chicago

FRANK L. OWSLEY
Vanderbilt University

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V NOVEMBER, 1939 NUMBER 4



Copyright, 1939, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas.</i> By Edwin Adams Davis.....	431
<i>John M. Berrien and the Administration of Andrew Jackson.</i> By Thomas P. Govan	447
<i>The Relations between Judah P. Benjamin and Jefferson Davis.</i> By Robert Douthat Meade.....	468
<i>The Indian Frontier in South Carolina as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary.</i> By Frank J. Klingberg.....	479
<i>Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist.</i> By William Diamond.....	501
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
The Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas. <i>Edited by David R. Barbee and Milledge L. Bonham, Jr.</i>	527
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Craven, <i>The Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861</i> , by Charles W. Ramsdell.....	553
Capers, <i>The Biography of a River Town: Memphis, Its Heroic Age</i> , by Mack Swearingen	554
Drake and Orndorff, <i>From Mill Wheel to Plowshare</i> , by Herbert A. Kellar Macartney and Dorrance, <i>The Bonapartes in America</i> , by E. Merton Coulter	556
Dawson, <i>A French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837</i> , by W. G. Bean.....	557
Parks, <i>Segments of Southern Thought</i> , by Charles Anderson.....	558
Holt, <i>Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901: As Revealed in the Correspondence of Herbert B. Adams</i> , by A. R. Newsome.....	559
Bolton, <i>Wider Horizons of American History</i> , by Edward Ott.....	563
Du Bois, <i>Black Folk, Then and Now</i> , by B. B. Kendrick.....	564
Van Deusen, <i>The Black Man in White America</i> , by B. I. Wiley.....	565
Cayton and Mitchell, <i>Black Workers and the New Unions</i> , by H. Clarence Nixon	567
Nixon, <i>Forty Acres and Steel Mules</i> , by Albert B. Moore.....	568
McFerrin, <i>Caldwell and Company</i> , by James W. Livingood.....	570
<i>Communication</i>	572
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	573
Personal	573
Bibliographical	575
Research Projects in Southern History. First Annual Supplement. <i>Compiled by Fred Cole</i>	581
<i>Contributors</i>	587

Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas

By EDWIN ADAMS DAVIS

The parish of West Feliciana¹ lies to the east of the Mississippi River, just south of the thirty-first parallel in the northwest corner of that section known as the Florida parishes of Louisiana.² The region was occupied early in Louisiana's colonial period, the first whites presumably having located near the Tunica Indians about 1712. Settlement progressed slowly through decades of French and English occupation. During the Spanish regime foreigners were granted land, many of the settlers coming from Virginia and the Carolinas, and by the time the United States acquired title to the territory the greater percentage of the population was American, although as late as 1828 tax collections were published in both French and English to meet the needs of a bilingual

¹ This paper was read at a joint session of the Agricultural History Society and the American Historical Association, Chicago, Illinois, December 28, 1938.

² The following works contain descriptions of the region: *An Account of Louisiana* (Washington, 1803), *passim*; Thomas Ashe, *Travels in America* (London, 1809), 294-95; Robert Baird [Richard Bache], *View of the Valley of the Mississippi* (Philadelphia, 1834), 275; William Bartram, *Travels Through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida* (Philadelphia, 1791), 432; H. M. Brackenridge, *Views of Louisiana* (Pittsburgh, 1814), 282-83; Theodore Clapp, *Autobiographical Sketches and Recollections* (Boston, 1857), 65; Zadock Cramer, *The Navigator* (Pittsburgh, 1806), 73-74; J. H. Ingraham, *The Sunny South* (Philadelphia, 1860), 296 ff.; Charles Lanman, *Adventures in the Wilds of the United States*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1856), I, *passim*; St. Francisville *Louisiana Journal*, May 27, 1828; Dunbar Rowland, *Mississippi*, 3 vols. (Atlanta, 1907), II, 966; Christian Schultz, *Travels on an Inland Voyage Through the States of New York . . . and Through the Territories of Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi and New Orleans* (New York, 1810), 181; William C. Stubbs, *A Handbook of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1895), 20; Amos Stoddard, *Sketches of Louisiana* (Philadelphia, 1812), 114-15; D. B. Warden, *A Statistical, Political, and Historical Account of the United States of North America*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh, 1819), II, 490-91, 498, 522-23, 531.

society.³ By 1820 the parish had passed the frontier stage, the best lands having been acquired by those who were to gain economic and political control of the region during the ensuing decade.

The 1830's saw West Feliciana develop into an extremely productive area, and with the southwestern counties of Mississippi it formed one of the richest economic sections south of Mason and Dixon's line. Here was found one of the few examples of the traditional old plantation South—a region where the modern legend actually existed: large plantations, an intelligent and cultured aristocracy, a gentry of sturdy stock, an important entrepôt in Bayou Sara-St. Francisville, and great wealth based on cotton and sugar cane. Plantation homes such as Rosedown (with its formal gardens, including marble statuary, as laid out by a French landscape architect), Ellerslie, Highland, The Cottage, Waverly, and others boasted a hospitality so well described by Timothy Flint: "The opulent planters . . . have many amiable traits of character. They are high-minded and hospitable in an eminent degree. I have sojourned much among them, and have never experienced a more frank, dignified, and easy hospitality."⁴

A member of this aristocratic feudal group was Bennet H. Barrow, master of Highland plantation. He was the youngest son of William Barrow, II, who migrated from North Carolina to the Felicianas during the late 1790's and settled Locust Grove plantation on the waters of Little Bayou Sara about twelve miles northwest of St. Francisville.⁵ He grew to manhood during a period of rapid plantation expansion, received little formal education, married at nineteen years of age,⁶ and, having inherited the home place of 1,400 arpents,⁷ renamed it High-

³ St. Francisville *Louisiana Journal*, June 21, 1828.

⁴ Timothy Flint, *Recollections of the Last Ten Years, Passed in Occasional Residences and Journeyings in the Valley of the Mississippi . . .* (Boston, 1826), 322.

⁵ For the Barrow family records, the writer is indebted to Mrs. D. I. Norwood of Highland plantation, Bains, Louisiana; Mrs. Leo Charles Browne of New Orleans; and Mrs. Wade Noland, Bains, Louisiana.

⁶ Barrow's wife was Miss Emily Joor. For the Joor family records, the writer is indebted to Miss Harriet Joor, Lafayette, Louisiana, and Mrs. Bentley Nicholson, New Orleans. Mrs. D. I. Norwood kindly lent C. B. Joor, "History of the Joors" (MSS. written in 1839).

⁷ Inventory of the estate of William Barrow, in West Feliciana Parish, Inventory Records, A, 327-42. Cited hereafter as Inventory Records. William Barrow left an estate in-

land, and in 1830 began his planting career. From 1833 to 1846 he kept a diary which gives a penetrative picture of various phases of Southern rural life: efforts at planting, sporting interests, the social life of the plantation, and, in many instances, personal feelings and opinions on matters public and private.⁸ He was continuously engaged in land deals; since he purchased much more often than he sold, his transactions gradually increased the total of his holdings. Full cash payment was rare, the usual procedure calling for approximately one third down, the balance within a three-year period; thus he depended upon his cotton and sugar crops to meet his payments. He was a shrewd buyer and usually purchased land at a "fair" price if not at a "bargain." At his death in 1854 he owned six plantations, approximately 5,000 arpents, appraised at slightly over \$70,000.⁹

Barrow faced the common financial problems of the Southland and attempted to work them out in much the same manner as contemporary agriculturists did in other sections of the plantation area. He was often careless and occasionally the disastrous results of his negligence turned his customary optimism into deep gloom.¹⁰ The constant purchase of land was a common Southern extravagance and therein he was no exception. Money was borrowed from banks and private individuals, and was loaned, though in much smaller amounts. Throughout his planting career he fulminated about the economic conditions of the time, the

ventoried at \$214,930.83, which included 7,160 arpents of land divided into six plantations. It also embraced 348 slaves and a secretary and books estimated at \$600. The arpent was an old French measure of land varying with the locality from .84 to 1.28 acres.

⁸ "The Plantation Diary of Bennet H. Barrow, 1833-1846," May 20, September 5, 1845. Cited hereafter as *Diary*. The diary is in one leather bound volume of approximately 500 manuscript pages. It is now in the possession of Mrs. Wade Noland, Bains, Louisiana, to whom the writer is indebted for permission to use it. Two typescript copies are at Louisiana State University, one in the Hill Memorial Library and one in the Department of Archives.

⁹ West Feliciana Parish, Notarial Records, E, 122-24, 320-21; F, 33-34, 258-59, 317-18; H, 346-48; K, 347-48. Cited hereafter as *Notarial Records*. See, also, Inventory Records, G, 135-43, for the inventory of his property.

¹⁰ On May 20, 1845, he wrote in his *Diary*: "By some carelessness have Lost a Letter from the Miss Swifts enclosed were two or three Blank notes & power of Att'y. to me as their agent, never in my Life had any thing to worry me as much—recollect of having it at my desk. suppose some of the children have destroyed it." He found the notes and power-of-attorney several months later. *Diary*, September 5, 1845.

antics of the politicians, and the insidious effect of the British market on the agricultural economy of the South. During the panic of 1837 he recorded in his diary that it was "all most impossible to raise one dollars. and that in shin plasters," but the bottom was not reached until 1842 when he reported that money was as "high as 4 per *ct* a month" and "scarce at that."¹¹

His commercial relations with his New Orleans factors were usually satisfactory.¹² For a period he transacted business with Finley and Company, but in 1839 changed to A. Ledoux and Company, "the best salesmen in the city," who promised to stamp his full name on his cotton bales instead of the usual B. H. B. and who immediately secured three and a half cents per pound more than he had theretofore received.¹³ It is impossible to determine accurately his yearly sales, which fluctuated between \$7,274 and \$24,839, or the amount of his indebtedness, though his diary records numerous loans.¹⁴ Ordinarily an amicable relationship existed between him and his creditors, but when one of them in 1840 unexpectedly called for his money, Barrow characterized his action as "most illiberal to make the least of it."¹⁵ A few months later he noted, "saw Mr. Turnbull [the owner of Rosedown] yesterday the only independent man to be met—Fat and pockets full of money."¹⁶ He generally collected his own loans without trouble and apparently was easily prevailed upon to endorse his neighbors' notes, a propensity responsible for many of his monetary misfortunes.¹⁷ A note for \$40,000

¹¹ *Ibid.*, January 2, 14, 1838; March 29, 1842.

¹² For a brief although excellent study of the Southern cotton marketing system, see Alfred H. Stone, "The Cotton Factorage System of the Southern States," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XX (1915), 557-65.

¹³ Diary, September 28, 1836; October 6, 31, 1838; October 5, 26, 1839; Barrow Accounts, October, 1839; July, 1840 (Louisiana State University Department of Archives). See, also, for the above-mentioned commission merchants, New Orleans *Price-Current and Commercial Intelligencer*, *passim*.

¹⁴ Diary, January 30, 1837; February 6, 1839; April 12, 1840; Barrow Accounts, 1839-1845.

¹⁵ Diary, March 11, 1840.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, October 5, 1842.

¹⁷ The generalization of Carl R. Fish, *The Rise of the Common Man, 1830-1850* (New York, 1927), 156, although perhaps hasty and inaccurate, is interesting in view of Barrow's experience with I. Desmont: "In the South . . . honor was to a large extent confused with honesty. This led to many tragedies from its misuse by the careless and by the

was endorsed, an obligation promptly settled, but between 1836 and 1846 Barrow evidently lost a little over \$22,000 on neighbors and friends. His largest loss was to I. Desmont, an English physician of "uncommonly gentlemanly manners—modesty and chastity," who later quit the country leaving him to pay between \$10,000 and \$16,000.¹⁸ The incident made a severe impression on the young planter, for in January, 1840, he remarked, "This crop would have paid every Dollar I owed—but owing to my Endorsing—Will take two more crops to clear me of Debt—never Endorse . . . for a man Extravagant & careless in business."¹⁹ Thus was the milk of Southern generosity curdled by contact with gentlemanly rascality.

Routine and production on a large plantation presented problems similar to those faced by the operator of any large economic unit.²⁰ Though production of staple crops was a major objective, there was a multiplicity of tasks to be performed during a twelvemonth: land to be cleared; stumps burned or pulled; staple and other crops planted and cultivated; buildings, implements, and tools repaired; spinning, weaving, sewing, and basket-making to satisfy the needs of nearly two hundred black folk—the thousand and one tasks the flesh was heir to on a well-organized plantation. Routine was well planned and executed: the completion of one task saw another begun and the vagaries of weather never halted slave labor long, for plantation efficiency did not allow idleness.

unscrupulous. A real Southern gentleman could rarely refuse to endorse a note if asked by another seeming gentleman. The number of families driven to penury by such careless assumptions of the risks of others is beyond belief, and in many cases the original signer of the note had nothing to risk, or protected himself by assignment to his wife or others."

¹⁸ Diary, August 20, November 9, December 19, 1839; Barrow Accounts, 1839.

¹⁹ Diary, January 21, 1840.

²⁰ The following articles will prove helpful in securing a picture of plantation routine and production in the St. Francisville-Natchez district: R. L. Allen, "Agriculture of Louisiana," in *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), III (1847), 412-17; Louise Butler, "West Feliciana, A Glimpse of Its History," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (New Orleans, 1917-), VII (1924), 90-120; Mack Swearingen, "Thirty Years of a Mississippi Plantation: Charles Whitmore of 'Montpelier,'" in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 198-211; Wendell H. Stephenson, "A Quarter-Century of a Mississippi Plantation: Eli J. Capell of 'Pleasant Hill,'" in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1915-), XXIII (1936), 355-74.

Barrow's money crop was cotton. His yearly planting averaged between 600 and 750 acres, which yielded an annual production of from 375 to slightly under 700 bales. In the early 1840's he began to experiment with sugar cane, finally turning to that crop as a staple shortly before his death a decade later.²¹ The making of a good crop was a source of satisfaction to the master of Highland, for appreciative comments of visitors and neighbors were entered in his diary. On one occasion he recorded, "they have seen no crop at all to compare with it, from half leg to waist high bolled & formed as well as can be for the season several grown Boles on a stalk."²² Sometimes lice, worms, grasshoppers, and other pests plagued him or plant diseases distracted his equanimity. In 1840 he wrote, "Never saw worse looking cotton. twisted trash beat in it & stained cotton blown so as not able to trace the rows, worms Eating all the Leaves off."²³ His slaves caused him little trouble, leading him to record: "never saw hands Work as Well, have never said a word to them—feeling an interest, they look a head and see What is to be done."²⁴ That they picked unusually well on occasion is evidenced by the fact that on one November day in 1838 the average picking was 364½ pounds for forty-two pickers.²⁵

Highland made a definite attempt to reach self-sufficiency. Oats, hay, and fodder were produced for livestock, corn and peas for both man and beast. The plantation truck garden had a regular crew of workers

²¹ Diary, January 24, March 17, 28, November 12, 1843; May 27, July 22, November 1, 1844. Barrow's work was carried on by his two eldest sons, John and James J. Barrow. Upon his death in 1854, they took over the management of the plantation and within a few years came to be numbered among the largest sugar producers of the parish. Their crop of 1857-1858 totaled 430 hogsheads. Two years later the crop remained about the same figure, but in 1861-1862 James J. Barrow, who had taken over the management of Highland plantation, produced 650 hogsheads. At this time he was the second largest sugar producer in West Feliciana, being exceeded only by William R. Barrow, an uncle. During this period vacuum pans were used, but by 1870 he had made many improvements. He had a brick and slate roof sugarhouse and refined his sugar by steam train, vacuum, and centrifugal methods. See P. A. Champomier, *Statement of the Sugar Crop Made in Louisiana in 1857-58* (New Orleans, 1858), 3; *ibid.*, 1859-60 (New Orleans, 1860), 3; L. Bouchereau, *Statement of the Sugar and Rice Crops Made in Louisiana in 1870-71* (New Orleans, 1871), 5.

²² Diary, June 12, 1842.

²³ *Ibid.*, September 4, 22, 29, 1840.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, April 16, 1840.

²⁵ Compiled from Barrow's table of cotton pickings.

in season, and potatoes, of the Irish and sweet varieties, pumpkins, beans, and other vegetables brought welcome dietary changes. Tobacco was grown for home consumption. The orchards below the quarter yielded peaches, plums, apples, and other fruits. Watermelons were produced on a large scale and during hot summer weather blacks became well acquainted with their tasty succulence. Between seventy and eighty head of work horses and mules were kept, and three or four yoke of oxen saw service getting timber and wood out of the swamps. Cattle numbered from one hundred and fifty to two hundred head, and on special occasions the inhabitants of the quarters were allowed fresh beef. Hogs, as well as sheep, were raised in large numbers, as many as three hundred being in the pens at one time. Large flocks of the usual barnyard fowls were kept for both their fruit and flesh, and many doubtless found their way surreptitiously into the steaming pots of slave cabins.

The effective operation of a plantation necessitated the use of machinery and involved the direction of a certain amount of mechanical work. Barrow, like most planters, depended upon the hoe as the most important tool of cotton production, but whenever possible he used horse-drawn implements.²⁶ His gins and presses were steam-driven, and by the late 1830's his sawmill and grinding mills had been converted from horsepower to steam power. Machinery was operated by slaves but repairs required the services of expert white labor at an average cost of about \$2.00 per day. Breakdowns often necessitated sending to New Orleans for parts, and work ceased until blacksmiths could make proper replacements.

Barrow was not a scientific planter. To be sure, he took agricultural journals, kept fairly well abreast of the times, and occasionally made experiments, but he is not to be counted among those patrons of Ceres who were more interested in agricultural improvements than in lucrative returns. He rotated crops, he manured fields (though it is not recorded that he ever purchased guano or commercial fertilizer), and he hauled

²⁶ It is interesting to note that the planter often depended upon his "Driver" to select the hoes purchased. Diary, June 5, 1838; April 1, 1840.

rich leafy molds from the nearby timber tracts. In 1837 he tried wrapping paper around seed corn; he grafted pear, peach, and apple trees; he practiced various methods for ridding his fields of squirrels and raccoons.²⁷ But his most profitable remuneration resulted from studying and improving the mechanical working habits of his field hands.²⁸

The thesis has been advanced that the most striking feature of Southern life was that black slaves furnished the bulk of its labor supply, not that her economic system was based on a staple crop. The plantation revolved around the slave quarter and Barrow undoubtedly took more time in the general organization of his plantation labor system than did many of the planter class. Barrow prepared rules for the government of his slaves with great care and rigidly enforced them.²⁹ As he phrased it, "A plantation might be considered as a piece of machinery, to operate successfully, all its parts should be uniform and exact." The master should be considered the "impelling force," and unless he was interested in the "proceedings" on his plantations, nothing but "indifference" was to be expected from his Negroes.³⁰ The slave's life was a regulated one; his sole purpose in being was the advancement of his master's economic interests. He could not marry away from the plantation; he could not wander about the country during the holidays or inclement weather; in fact, the quarters were the center of his world, for Barrow believed that if the slave was made "comfortable at Home," if the essentials of contentment were provided for him, there would be little inclination for him to shirk his work or be dissatisfied. In his general outlook on the institution of slavery, he was typical of his time and section. He dis-

²⁷ *Ibid.*, October 27, 1837; March 27, April 13, 1838; January 22, 1840.

²⁸ Of this experiment he wrote: "I am well paid for my trouble in teaching my small gang to Hoe, never saw such hoe hands as they are, two year[s] ago took two on a row—now Eequal to a woman, in dricting them to make a slow & sure lick in one place & to cut the full width of the hoe every time—unless reminded of it they would stand & make 4 or 5." *Ibid.*, April 16, 1840.

²⁹ In addition to the works of Ulrich B. Phillips, descriptions of plantation management may be found in Valcour Aime, *Plantation Diary* (New Orleans, 1878); Franklin L. Riley (ed.), "The Diary of Dr. John M. Phillips," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications* (Oxford, etc., 1897-1914; Centenary Series, 1916-1925), X (1909), 305-481; "Dr. John C. Jenkins Plantation Diary" (Elgin plantation, Natchez, Mississippi, typescript in Department of Archives, Louisiana State University).

³⁰ The "Rules for Highland Plantation" are found in Barrow's Diary.

approved of the abolition movement and condemned bitterly all forms of close association between planter and slave.³¹ On the other hand, he could not condone extreme cruelty to that underprivileged class, in one instance saying, "A meaner set than the Howells do not live—cruel and unjust in the extreme,"³² and in another narrating graphically, "Went to Town man tried for Whipping a negro to Death. trial will continue till to morrow—deserves death—Cleared!"³³ He commented in his diary on the character of certain of his slaves. On the death of Old Orange, he wrote: "A more perfect negro never lived, faithful honest & purely religious, never knew him guilty of a wrong."³⁴ When George was drowned, the entry ran thus: "a very great loss. one of the best negros I ever saw. or knew. to his family as a White person."³⁵ On more than one occasion he defended his slaves when accused unjustly of some crime committed in the neighborhood and once came to the financial aid of Jerry who had had \$4.00 in counterfeit money passed off on him.³⁶ On the other hand, he censured erring hands and once called Jim "the meanest, dirtiest boy I ever had."³⁷

While it is impossible to determine the exact number of black folks living at Highland plantation, there apparently were slightly less than two hundred. Barrow's accounts show that while he bought a few slaves from time to time, with one exception they were all purchased in Louisiana,³⁸ and that, during the entire period under consideration, he sold only two Negroes. In 1836 he sent Big Sam and Amy to New Orleans,

³¹ In the Diary, March 20, 1840, he wrote: "Wash. Pennington repairing my Gin—the most perfect fool I know—stands and talks to the negros &c. negros no more respect *him* than a negro."

³² *Ibid.*, September 15, 1840.

³³ *Ibid.*, May 21, 1839.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, January 15, 1843.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, October 7, 1837.

³⁶ In 1839 a neighbor's gin was "fired" and Dennis was blamed. Whereupon Barrow planned a call upon the neighbor, and wrote, "if he says it was Dennis I will curse him and if I ever catch one of his negros on this side of the creek will make them see sights." *Ibid.*, December 11, 1839.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, January 24, 1838.

³⁸ Regarding Negroes from the Upper South he wrote: "I will never buy grown negros from Va.—or upper Country—small boys and girls may do, but grown ones are not worth as much—by at least one third as our creoles—one creole will pick as much as two of them." *Ibid.*, October 18, 1836.

realizing \$1,760 for the pair and recording that they were "not worth \$5." Until the fall of 1837 Barrow employed overseers to direct his plantation labor but at that time he became so exasperated that he wrote: "More Whiping to do this Fall than all together in three years owing to my D mean Overseer—never will have another unless I should be compelled to leave—they are a perfect nuisance."³⁹ Evidently from this time until his death he depended on himself and his drivers to keep the organization moving.⁴⁰

The master of Highland believed his slaves to be above average, for he frequently mentioned their good qualities. They were well housed and fed, and received gifts of clothing and money at Christmas time.⁴¹ They were divided into rival gangs for cotton picking or other stipulated tasks, with the losing side giving dinners; and individuals sometimes worked against each other for a prize donated by the master. There were times, however, when work was not well done and he was prompted to make entries such as the following: "my Hands worked badly . . . general Whiping," or "Whipped every hand in the field this evening."⁴² From numerous notations in his diary it would appear that his slaves were a sickly lot; a closer scrutiny, however, shows this was not the case: medical attention was provided on every necessary occasion, with physician's bills during some years totaling well over \$500. Despite all precautions, lockjaw, ruptures, pleurisy, influenza, common colds, and injuries of various types were a constant source of worry.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, October 2, 1837.

⁴⁰ On one occasion he wrote: "I hope the time will come When every Overseer in the country will be compelled to addopt some other mode of making a living—they are a perfect nuisance cause dissatisfaction among the negros—being more possessed of more brutal feelings—I make better crops than those Who employ them." *Ibid.*, July 25, 1839.

⁴¹ In his "Rules" Barrow explained: "I prefer giving them money of Christmas to their making any thing, thereby creating an interest with you and yours . . . if a negro is suffered to sell any thing he chooses without any inquiry being made, a spirit of trafficking at once is created. to carry this on, both means and time are necessary, neither of which is he of right possessed. A negro would not be content to sell only What he raises or makes of either corn . . . or poultry, or the like, but he would sell a part of his allowance also, and would be tempted to commit robberies to obtain things to sell." The monetary gift for 1838 amounted to \$500, but it was increased to \$700 during the two succeeding years. Diary, December 24, 1838; December 22, 1839; December 24, 1840; Barrow Accounts, 1839, 1841.

⁴² Diary, January 4, April 27, 1839.

Neglect of midwives or mothers took a heavy toll of infants and many were lost through reporting illness too late for medical attention. Barrow was not a strict religionist, but "Sunday being a day of rest to the negros, I like to be about—allowance day—& they frequently want things not convenient to get any other day."⁴³ He did not force religion upon his people, and on one occasion when a neighbor's slaves were "cutting up a great many shines" he wrote that the trouble had grown out of having "preached to [them] for 4 or 5 years past—greatest piece of foolishness any one ever guilty of no true Christianity among Church going Whites—& how Expect to Preach morality among a set of ignorant beings—proper discipline may improve them and make them better."⁴⁴ Slave marriages were common at Highland and interracial promiscuity was bitterly condemned, for on one occasion he wrote: "had a general Whiping frolick. White men sending for some of my women by one of my boys. 'one eyed Sam'—a loade of buck shot will be the dose if I can see them or find them."⁴⁵

Barrow was very particular about housing conditions: cabins were repaired yearly, new wells dug or old ones cleaned, and additional buildings erected to offset depredations of time. The jail, though used infrequently, was always kept in good repair. In 1838 a dance hall was constructed and was often used. Barrow was generous in the clothing allotment of two suits per year, two extra pairs of shoes for winter months, and new blankets every third year, with an occasional new suit or a new dress as a reward for good work. Food supplies were carefully watched. Meat was the foundation of slave diet and the allowance was ordinarily five pounds of "Clear good meat" per week for each slave above the age of four years.⁴⁶ Hogs, sheep, cattle, and poultry were consumed in large quantities, particularly during holiday periods. Large supplies of molasses and sugar were bought to satisfy the sweet

⁴³ *Ibid.*, March 30, 1840; also in "Rules for Highland Plantation."

⁴⁴ Diary, April 19, 1844. On October 11 Barrow wrote: "went to Miss Swifts. nearly all of their hands have run off. from pure impudence founded in their 'Negro's.' religion, & wish by that means to run the overseer off, will see them put in order, my health permitting."

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, September 4, 1837.

⁴⁶ "Rules for Highland Plantation."

tooth of the black, and, to offer variety from the ordinary ration of cornmeal, flour was sometimes purchased.⁴⁷

The Black Code caused Barrow little anxiety, for there is no record that any violations of consequence were ever attributed to his slaves. The stealing of small articles was of course a common problem and light cotton pickings, punishments, and imagined abuses were frequent causes for the taking of French leave by the inhabitants of the quarter.⁴⁸ Barrow usually rounded up his own runaways, though on one occasion he sent for professional slave hunters. For habitual absconders he sometimes prescribed rough treatment, the description of one incident being: "ran and trailed about a mile *treed* him, made the dogs pull him out of the tree, Bit him very badly, think he will stay home a while."⁴⁹ Of a similar case he wrote: "dogs soon tore him naked, took him Home Before the other negro[es] at dark & made the dogs give him another over hauling."⁵⁰ But these were exceptional cases. Barrow believed that prospective rewards for good behavior and well-performed labor were better incentives than fear of punishment. Dinners, holidays, dances, and celebrations were common and are evidenced by a typical diary entry: "finding no Cotton to trash, sent for the Fiddle And made them Dance from 12 till dark."⁵¹

The ante-bellum plantation was not only the center of a fairly complete system of a staple economy; it was also the nucleus of the social life of the planter class.⁵² Visiting was a popular diversion, "frollics" were indulged in, many of them impromptu, and one of these Barrow described. After having "kidnapped" a number of young ladies he

⁴⁷ The purchase of large amounts of sugar and flour was an unusual plantation expenditure.

⁴⁸ "I had rather a negro would do any thing Else than runaway," Barrow once wrote, and his punishments for this act were usually severe. Diary, October 3, 1839.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, September 6, 1845.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, November 11, 1845.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, January 1, 1846.

⁵² The social history of the Old South is yet to be written. Much interesting material, however, is to be found in the works of Phillips, William E. Dodd, Susan D. Smedes, and others. An excellent work for North Carolina is Guion G. Johnson, *Ante-Bellum North Carolina, A Social History* (Chapel Hill, 1937).

"Would not Let any Leave—got a violin player from Town . . . Let them rest & knap during the day some times. playing smut—at dark began to dance . . . never have seen A collection so sudden[ly] and so perfectly free easy & happy for two days & nights, All restraint thrown aside never enjoyed myself as much."⁵³ On occasion formal balls were attended, horseback rides and drives were common, and practical joking was enjoyed by all. Hunting was a popular sport. The hounds were followed as in Maryland or Virginia, and in addition deer, bear, raccoon, opossum, alligators, and wild fowl were hunted by torchlight, on horseback, and in parties by "standing."⁵⁴ Radcliff's Lake, Big and Little Bayou Sara creeks offered sport for the followers of Izaak Walton.⁵⁵

From the beginning of his career until 1840 Barrow was one of the most prominent racing men of his parish and state.⁵⁶ He was the second largest stockholder in the St. Francisville Race Track until he sold his interests to Daniel Turnbull of Rosedown plantation.⁵⁷ He was a familiar figure at the New Orleans tracks and for a time was an official timer at the Louisiana Jockey Club.⁵⁸ He ordinarily bet small sums and often won.⁵⁹ In his racing activities he was associated with his brother, William R. Barrow, and together they developed two horses, Fanny Bell and Josh Bell, who became well known throughout the South.⁶⁰

⁵³ Diary, January 7, 8, 1842.

⁵⁴ For an excellent contemporary account of hunting in this section of Louisiana, see T. B. Thorpe [Tom Owen, the Bee Hunter], "Sporting in Louisiana," in *Spirit of the Times* (New York, 1831-1861), XI (1841), 571. Of Thorpe the editor wrote, "His communications are sought after with the avidity of a Pete Whetstone, a Cypress, a Shingle Splitter, or a Snaffle." *Ibid.*, 385.

⁵⁵ The Barrow family had a steamer, the *Nimrod*, which was used for fishing and hunting excursions. See *ibid.*, 331, for an account of its first hunting trip. In the years following 1841 it is mentioned frequently.

⁵⁶ Speaking of "the Messrs. Barrow" and several other racing enthusiasts of the state, one correspondent of the *Spirit of the Times* wrote, "On such men, and their example and influence, depends the turf in the future . . . and without such support, the sooner it goes down the better." *Ibid.*, IX (1839), 405.

⁵⁷ Notarial Records, I, 192-93. Barrow sold his interest on March 13, 1840.

⁵⁸ *Spirit of the Times*, VIII (1838), 364.

⁵⁹ Diary, November 30, December 20, 1838; Barrow Accounts, 1842, 1843.

⁶⁰ Diary, May 5, 1838; April 2, 1839; July 23, 1845; Barrow Accounts, 1839, 1843; *Spirit of the Times*, VIII (1838), 28, 39, 60, 356-57, 364; XII (1842), 534.

Concerning the latter horse Barrow once wrote, "I believe Jos Bell is the Best Horse in the United States—First rate any distance."⁶¹

The personal life of Barrow was similar to that of men of his station in the parish of West Feliciana and in other sections of the South. Optimistic though he was, the fertile lands of Texas and Mississippi continually beckoned;⁶² his indebtedness was a source of worry, and yet extravagant purchases were not infrequent; though satisfied with the organization of his plantation he would write, "am perfectly disgusted with evry thing on the place."⁶³ He confided to his diary his private opinion of relatives, friends, and neighbors. The whole Barrow family, with only two exceptions, he remarked, were "liberal & honest, and are like familes ought to be. united,"⁶⁴ but on another occasion, wrote: "Ruffins trainer Mr. Tisdale returned from Kentucky—bringing with him 19 beautifull dogs 5 intended for me lost or died—strange that only *mine* should have died."⁶⁵ Of one of his neighbors he said: "a meaner man never lived";⁶⁶ and concerning another individual, "A Mr Vidall staid . . . with me last night a perfect Jack ass Fop & *gawk*."⁶⁷ He was critical of people from the North and during the visit of two "D. Yankees" noted especially "the impudence of their section of the country," finally giving them a "hint to Leave that no southernor would mistake—ordered their horses Back."⁶⁸ His endorsing troubles led him to write, "sincerely wish evry rascal & persons causing me to be in Debt in Hell *riding a red hot iron*."⁶⁹

⁶¹ Diary, February 15, 1839. The *Spirit of the Times*, XII (1842), 534, carried the following: "Josh Bell was one of the best horses of his year. In March, 1839, he beat Wagner the 1st heat in a four miles race at New Orleans on the Eclipse Course; the next week he walked over for a purse of \$1,500, Three mile heats, on the Louisiana Course, and in the following week won a purse of \$1,200 at Three mile heats on the Metairie Course."

⁶² Diary, February 19, September 8, 1841.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, May 5, 20, 1844.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, March 11, 1840.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, October 19, 1839.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, July 2, 1840.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, October 10, 1839.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, April 26, 1843; February 26, 1844.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, May 5, 1844. On January 1, 1840, he wrote: "My course will be a Lesson to my children—that is never to loan What is not your own—if you owe any thing pay it first—I borrowed money for other persons 'friend' & now have to pay it over. Mind Who

Mildly interested in national politics, only three issues caused him real concern: corruption in public office, the annexation of Texas, and the slavery question. He was normally a Whig but bolted the party in 1844 to vote for Polk. In state politics party lines meant little to him, and he jumped from candidate to candidate with alacrity and abandon. He held to the democratic view that the holding of office was a public duty and during the period from 1833 to 1846 was overseer of his road district, overseer of the poor, and member of the Grand Jury and the Police Jury. The Police Jury's records indicate, however, that he was not regular in attendance, for he was fined on several occasions for failure to attend meetings.⁷⁰ His cultural life was typical. He subscribed to newspapers and magazines, he bought books, attended concerts, invited artists to his country estate, had his portrait painted by Tom Thorpe, the noted "Bee Hunter,"⁷¹ gave his children dancing lessons, and hired tutors for their private instruction. His parlor boasted several musical instruments; his newspaper shelf held the *Charleston Mercury*, the *Woodville Republican*, the *Spirit of the Times*, and other publications; and on his book shelves were Botta's *Washington* and Johnson's *Life of Henry Clay*. He attended church infrequently and was inclined to indulge in outbursts against wearers of the cloth, but contributed liberally to churches and to charity. His own personal code is indicated by two entries: "A Harralson died yesterday I shall loose by him \$1300. his family will be dependent on a negro woman I have a mortgage on—as a matter of course—cannot take her";⁷² and on another occasion, "so far have never injured any human being to my knowledge."⁷³

A sharply realistic view of the personality of Bennet H. Barrow will professes to be your friend—you see a man working hard & economising help him, but see a fellow dressing fine, using fine language & they are What is called clever fellows—let them pass."

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, December 7, 1836; May 8, June 3, 1844; June 2, September 27, December 1, 1845; West Feliciana Parish, Minutes of the Police Jury, II, 88, 90, 91, 92, 103, 104, 106, 107, 109, 111; West Feliciana Parish, Records of the Police Jury, II, 4, 48, 72, 101, 122.

⁷¹ Diary, May 4, 1841; May 7, 1842; Barrow Accounts, 1841.

⁷² Diary, October 8, 1839.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, April 20, 1845.

never be sketched. He related his story briefly, sketchily, but on the whole accurately, in his diary. Frequently he interjected intimate details, each one small but in the aggregate extremely helpful for those of us who find the essence of history in human touches not ordinarily incorporated in secondary works, and revelatory of neglected elements of objective history. On September 22, 1836, he wrote: "Here I am sitting with the Baby in my lap . . . Emily criticising the History of Georgia—Caroline and John at all kinds of Mischief," and, again, on August 23 of the following year, "Attempting to learn James & John their book—had rather drive a team of mules . . . John looks one way & thinks another." Thus the common vexations of humanity beset even Bennet H. Barrow, planter of Old Feliciana.

John M. Berrien and the Administration of Andrew Jackson

By THOMAS P. GOVAN

John M. Berrien of Georgia, attorney general in the first cabinet of Andrew Jackson, was not among the dominant figures of that administration. Yet he played a vital part in it despite the fact that he was not interested in the political advancement of Martin Van Buren or John C. Calhoun, and was friendly to the Bank of the United States. The emphasis that has been placed on these two phases of the administration, while correct from the point of view of the general historian, has resulted in some distortion and in a misinterpretation of the actions and opinions of many of the lesser figures of that period. This has been particularly true in the case of Berrien, who before 1824 and after 1833 was a political opponent of Jackson, yet whose participation in the administration as a cabinet officer was entirely natural in view of the political situation and interests of his state.

One of the principal reasons for the virtual unanimity of the support for Jackson in Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi¹ was the widespread hostility to the Indian policy of President Adams. This was particularly true in Georgia where the refusal of the President and his secretary of war, James Barbour, to force the removal of the Creek Indians had nearly precipitated an armed encounter between the militia of the state and the United States army.² Jackson, on the other hand, was committed to an Indian policy favorable to the states of the South and

¹ Georgia: Jackson, 19,363 votes; Adams, none. Tennessee: Jackson, 44,293; Adams, 2,240. Alabama: Jackson, 17,138; Adams, 1,938. Mississippi: Jackson, 6,772; Adams, 1,581. Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1928), I, 148.

² Ulrich B. Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights* (Washington, 1902), 55-65.

West. As early as 1820 he had attempted to persuade John C. Calhoun, secretary of war in the Monroe cabinet, that the Indians of the Southwest should be forced to give up their lands in exchange for an equal area west of the Mississippi.³ He never departed from his belief in the wisdom of this solution of the Indian problem. No other policy was closer to his heart, and none received a larger share of his personal attention during his entire administration. In fact, it was largely because of this question that he insisted on having one of two personal friends and fellow Tennesseans, Hugh L. White or John H. Eaton (the one finally selected), as secretary of war.⁴

Berrien along with most of the people of Georgia agreed with this policy of Jackson. He had been closely identified with the attempt by Georgia to force the administrations of Monroe and Adams to fulfill the agreement of 1802 between the United States and Georgia and remove both the Creek and Cherokee Indians from the state.⁵ And it is probable that it was this connection with the Indian question that caused Eaton to recommend that Berrien be offered the place of attorney general and Jackson to consent to it.⁶ Both of them knew that Berrien, as a Georgian, would support them in their efforts to remove the Indians not only

³ Andrew Jackson to John C. Calhoun, September 2, 1820, in John S. Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, 6 vols. (Washington, 1926-1935), III, 31-32.

⁴ *Id.*, *The Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1925), 413-14, 687; John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Autobiography of Martin Van Buren*, in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1918, II (Washington, 1920), 312.

⁵ Berrien as a member of the Georgia legislature had prepared a report demanding the immediate removal of the Creek and Cherokee Indians, and condemning President Monroe and Secretary Calhoun for their neglect of this matter. Later as United States senator, during the administration of John Quincy Adams, he had been active in the defense of Governor George M. Troup in the bitter dispute over the refusal of President Adams to put the Treaty of Indian Springs, providing for the removal of the Creek, into effect. Berrien had also been a member of the select committee of the Senate to which was referred the President's message of 1827 threatening the use of the armed forces of the nation against Georgia. The report of this committee was conciliatory in tone, and led to the negotiation of a new treaty with the Creek, in which they agreed to give up their remaining lands in Georgia. *American State Papers* (fol. ed.), *Indian Affairs*, II, 747, 749, 869-72; *Congressional Debates*, 19 Cong., 1 Sess., 620-23 (April 22, 1826); 2 Sess., 273-74, 498 (February 5, March 1, 1827).

⁶ Louis McLane to Martin Van Buren, February 19, 1829; Jackson to *id.*, August 8, 1831, Van Buren MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); Jackson's Case against Calhoun, February, 1831, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 235; Memorandum in Jackson's handwriting, September, 1831 (?), *ibid.*, 343.

with his talent as a lawyer, but also because he whole-heartedly sympathized with the aims of this policy which was of vital interest to his state.

During the two years of his association with the Jackson administration Berrien was called on to deliver only one formal opinion on an Indian question,⁷ but he seems to have been a close and active adviser on all phases of the problem. In June, 1830, when Jackson left Washington for the summer, he gave a letter to Berrien, which said:

As I am about to be absent from the seat of government, and circumstances may render it proper for you to proceed to Georgia, or to the Creek or Cherokee nation during the interval, I have thought it proper to put you in [possession?] in proper form of the authority under which you will act. Having conversed with you fully on the subjects connected with the relations of the government of the United States with the State of Georgia and those tribes, you will be able to [explain?] my views to the constitutional authorities of that state, and to the chief warriors of the tribes. . . . In the meantime this letter will serve to evidence to those with whom you may have occasion to transact any business connected with these subjects that you are acting with my approbation and under my authority.⁸

Berrien also acted as an intermediary between the President and Governor George R. Gilmer of Georgia, aiding both in the carrying out of their common endeavor to force the removal of the Cherokee from northern Georgia.⁹ He apparently made two trips to the Indian country at the request of President Jackson, and was absent on one of these missions in the spring of 1831 when Van Buren and Eaton resigned from the cabinet.¹⁰

Berrien, however, aside from his connection with the Indian policy, seems to have had little influence in the administration. He carried on the work of his department, but his views on general measures apparently were of no effect. At this time he was opposed to the tariff both as

⁷ Benjamin F. Hall (comp.), *Official Opinions of the Attorney General of the United States*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1852), II, 321-29.

⁸ Jackson to Berrien, June 16, 1830, Berrien MSS. (in possession of Mrs. Rosa Burroughs, Savannah, Georgia).

⁹ Gilmer to *id.*, February 8, 1830, *ibid.*; *id.* to *id.*, May 6, 1830, May 17, 1831, in George R. Gilmer, *Sketches of Some of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia, of the Cherokees and the Author* (New York, 1855), 340-41, 398-99.

¹⁰ Macon *Georgia Telegraph*, April 27, 1831; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, May 19, 1831; Francis Scott Key to Roger B. Taney, June 14, 1831, in Samuel Tyler, *Memoir of Roger Brooke Taney, L.L.D.* (Baltimore, 1872), 168-71.

a principle and a policy, and was in favor of the continuance of the Bank of the United States. He made no attempt to conceal his views on these questions, and as late as April, 1831, the cashier of the Savannah branch of the Bank of the United States wrote of him to Nicholas Biddle, "I had much pleasure in meeting with my friend Mr. Berrien at Milledgeville—He is decidedly in favor of the Bank of the United States, and his opinions here had their influence."¹¹

Neither Jackson nor Eaton made any attempt to ascertain Berrien's views on this or any other subject before inviting him to join the cabinet,¹² and his opinions on public questions seem to have had no influence on his dismissal from it. He had for many years been employed as an attorney for the Savannah branch of the Bank, and in February, 1829, had been retained to represent the Bank in a pending controversy with the state banks of Georgia.¹³ When Jackson was preparing his initial message to Congress, he requested Berrien to supply him with an informal opinion as to the constitutionality of the Bank. Berrien replied and urged the President not to raise the question at that particular time, since he was not called on to perform any act concerning the Bank's charter during his elected term. The Attorney General did not expressly affirm his own belief in the constitutionality of the Bank, but informed the President that the existence of his power had been affirmed at various times and in different forms by every department of the government. He then added:

If this power is not granted by the Constitution, it is very certain, that no series of usurpations can give it a legitimate existence in that instrument. Since however an ins[ti]tution now exists, which results from the exercise of that power, it seems to me that the question of constitutional power may be wisely left to rest on the footing on which anterior decisions have placed it, so far as the Executive department is concerned, until that department shall be called on to do some act, which will necessarily raise this question. If this view of the subject should not accord with the determinations of the President, the attorney General will cheer-

¹¹ James Hunter to Nicholas Biddle, April 23, 1831, Biddle MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

¹² Berrien to Eaton, July 29, 1831, Berrien MSS.

¹³ Biddle to Leslie Coombs, April 25, 1827; *id.* to John Sergeant, January 5, 1829; *id.* to George B. Cumming, February 10, 1829, Biddle MSS.

fully submit his opinion on the question of constitutional power, whenever it shall be desired.¹⁴

His formal opinion on the Bank was never requested, and he left the cabinet before the active controversy between the administration and the Bank began.

Berrien also refrained from any participation in the rivalry between the partisans of Calhoun and Van Buren.¹⁵ He had been a political supporter and close friend of William H. Crawford and shared the latter's dislike and distrust of Calhoun. In addition, as a Georgian, he had resented Calhoun's apparent reluctance to force the Indians out of Georgia when the South Carolinian had been in charge of Indian affairs during the Monroe administration.¹⁶ Neither Calhoun nor any of the South Carolinians, Robert Y. Hayne, William Drayton, George McDuffie, and James Hamilton, Jr., who were consulted by Jackson prior to the formation of the cabinet, had anything to do with the selection of Berrien as attorney general.¹⁷ In fact the appointment was bitterly resented by Calhoun's friends of the Clarke party in Georgia, one of whom wrote Jackson warning him that he was taking into his cabinet a man who had, as

¹⁴ Berrien to Jackson, November 27, 1829, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 94-95.

¹⁵ Public letter of Berrien, in *Washington National Intelligencer*, July 23, 1831, quoted in *Niles' Weekly Register* (Baltimore, 1811-1849), XL (1831), 380-81; *Milledgeville Southern Recorder*, August 4, 1831.

¹⁶ In this connection it should be noted that Calhoun had received only two of Georgia's nine votes in the electoral college as a result of the opposition of the Crawford-Troup party of which Berrien was a member.

¹⁷ James Hamilton, Jr., to Van Buren, January 23, February 19, 1829; Robert Y. Hayne to *id.*, February 14, 1829, Van Buren MSS. The influence of Calhoun on the formation of the cabinet has frequently been exaggerated. Calhoun, himself, in the fall of 1831, said, "General Jackson never consulted me as to the formation of his cabinet." Richard K. Crallé (ed.), *The Works of John C. Calhoun*, 6 vols. (New York, 1855), VI, 443. James A. Hamilton, Van Buren's personal representative in Washington, on February 18, 1829, wrote, "The Calhoun influence . . . is not however very great." And on February 21 he quoted Major William B. Lewis as saying that the cabinet was "decidedly friendly to V.B.," and added his own statement, "be assured Calhoun is disappointed." James A. Hamilton to Van Buren, February 18, 21, 1829, Van Buren MSS. The only political associate of Calhoun appointed to the cabinet was Samuel D. Ingham of Pennsylvania, and this appointment was disappointing to Calhoun's friends, James Hamilton, Jr., and Hayne, who desired either Langdon Cheves, former president of the Bank of the United States, or Louis McLane of Delaware, for the treasury. James Hamilton, Jr., to Van Buren, February 19, 1829, Van Buren MSS.

a member of the Crawford-Troup party, participated in the virulent attacks on Calhoun and Jackson prior to 1824, and who had supported Jackson in 1828 only "as an alternative," after Crawford's defeat and disability had destroyed the possibility of his elevation to the presidency.¹⁸

As a follower of Crawford, Berrien had been associated with Van Buren, who had also supported the Georgian in 1824. After the defeat of Crawford both Van Buren and Berrien had gone over to the Jackson party, and had co-operated in opposition to the policies of President Adams in the Senate. But in spite of these political associations the two men were never intimate and their intercourse was largely limited to official matters.¹⁹ Van Buren's choice for the position of attorney general had been Louis McLane of Delaware. He was surprised by the selection of Berrien, and neither he nor any of his supporters had anything to do with the appointment.²⁰ Some of them, at any rate, looked with disfavor on Berrien from the beginning. They knew he was not an intimate friend nor a political associate of Calhoun, but he was not committed to Van Buren, which, to them, was just as bad. For as Churchill C. Cambreleng, one of them, in a letter to Van Buren, wrote:

We now know our enemies, and our motto should be those who are not with us are against us, we shall now have, what was at one time feared we should not have, a party administration and it must be governed by party principles—and if

¹⁸ Tomlinson Fort to Jackson, June 1, 1829, Fort MSS. (Chattanooga Public Library). Cf. Thomas W. Cobb to Charles Tait, March 8, 1822, Tait MSS. (Alabama Department of Archives and History); Gilmer to Monroe, May 20, 1822, in Gilmer, *Sketches of Some of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia*, 288-91; public letter of Wilson Lumpkin in reply to William H. Crawford, in the Milledgeville *Georgia Journal*, 1831, quoted in Wilson Lumpkin, *The Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia*, 2 vols. (New York, 1907), II, 296-300.

¹⁹ Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Autobiography of Martin Van Buren*, 213-14, 216.

²⁰ Van Buren to James A. Hamilton, dated February 2, 1829, but obviously written after February 19, in James A. Hamilton, *Reminiscences of Hamilton, or Men and Events at Home and Abroad during Three Quarters of a Century* (New York, 1869), 91; Van Buren to Churchill C. Cambreleng, December 17, 1828; James A. Hamilton to Van Buren, February 18, 1829, Van Buren MSS. When Berrien was offered the post of minister to England at the recommendation of Littleton W. Tazewell on April 6, 1829, Van Buren persuaded Jackson to offer the place as attorney general to Louis McLane. Berrien, however, refused the ministry, which was then offered to McLane who accepted it. Jackson to Berrien, April 6, 1829, Berrien MSS.; McLane to Van Buren, April 15, 1829, Van Buren MSS.; Berrien to Jackson, April 9, 1829, Jackson MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); James A. Hamilton, *Reminiscences*, 130-31.

the Post-Master and the Atty-General do not accord in that sentiment there are others equally able and meritorious who will.²¹

Berrien's situation between the conflicting ambitions of Van Buren and Calhoun was further complicated by local political controversies in Georgia. Both parties in the state had supported Jackson in 1828, but old rivalries were renewed the following year in the gubernatorial campaign. Two candidates were brought forward by different factions of the Troup-Crawford party as a result of a personal quarrel between Gilmer and John Forsyth. The Clarke party did not name a candidate but supported Gilmer in opposition to Joel Crawford, the nominee of the Forsyth-Crawford faction of the Troup party, and Gilmer was elected.²² There is no evidence that Berrien took any part in this campaign. He was apparently friendly to both factions. Both fully supported the Jackson administration, particularly in regard to the Indian question, in which Berrien was actively concerned.

The existence of this split in his party, however, was an additional reason for him to refrain from any interference in the quarrel between the supporters of Van Buren and Calhoun. William H. Crawford and Forsyth were among those who had informed Jackson of Calhoun's attitude toward his conduct of the Seminole War. This revelation was the immediate cause of the open rupture between Calhoun and Jackson and was largely responsible for the complete triumph of the supporters of Van Buren. Berrien did not like Van Buren, but if he had gone over to Calhoun he would have alienated Forsyth and Crawford and would have had to ally himself with the Clarke party, among whose members the friends of Calhoun in Georgia were to be found. Yet, if he had openly joined the partisans of Van Buren and tied himself closely to Forsyth and Crawford, he would have had to break with Governor Gilmer with whom he had been intimately associated. For these reasons he did nothing.

When the quarrel between Jackson and Calhoun was brought out into

²¹ Cambreleng to Van Buren, March 1, 1829, Van Buren MSS. Cf. James A. Hamilton, *Reminiscences*, 130-31.

²² Gilmer to Fort, August 27, 1829, Fort MSS.; Gilmer, *Sketches of Some of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia*, 310-11, 316-17, 566; Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights*, 110-11.

the open, Berrien, according to his own statement, "studiously avoided all interference, except to deprecate Mr. Calhoun's publication," because of "the connection of Mr. Crawford with this controversy, and my own relation to gen. Jackson."²³ No attempt was made to connect Berrien with Calhoun in the early stages of the controversy. It was only after the dissolution of the cabinet and Berrien's publication of his correspondence with Eaton that any such connection was charged. Jackson first made the direct accusation in a private letter to David Burford of Tennessee on July 28, 1831, and it was publicly repeated by Eaton in a letter published in September, 1831.²⁴ To this Berrien immediately replied on September 23: "The charge that I was at any time the partisan of Mr. Calhoun, is utterly destitute of foundation. Mr. Eaton cannot impute to me any act or expression which will give the slightest countenance to this assertion."²⁵ Calhoun also replied to Eaton's letter. He, unlike Berrien, had no imperative political reason for denying any political relation between them, and he made no attempt to deny the accuracy of Eaton's designation of Samuel D. Ingham, secretary of the treasury, as his friend and supporter. It is therefore significant that Calhoun called attention to the misstatement of Eaton that John Branch, secretary of the navy, and Berrien were also political associates of the Vice-President as evidence of the unreliability of other statements in Eaton's letter.²⁶

Despite these denials by both Calhoun and Berrien of any political relations between them, the charges were repeated, and have been accepted by almost all of the writers on the Jackson administration. This

²³ Public letter of Berrien, *Niles' Weekly Register*, XL (1831), 381.

²⁴ Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 318-19; *Niles' Weekly Register*, XLI (1831), 50, 55-56, 60-62.

²⁵ *Niles' Weekly Register*, XLI (1831), 81.

²⁶ Crallé (ed.), *Works of John C. Calhoun*, VI, 442. In this regard an extract from a letter of Berrien to Gilmer on February 3, 1855, when both were old men and retired from politics, is of interest. Gilmer in his rambling autobiography, *Sketches of Some of the First Settlers of Upper Georgia*, 463-65, had stated that Berrien had been an adherent of Calhoun. Berrien wrote to him: "The second remark to which I have reference represents me as a nullifier, and adherent of Mr. Calhoun. This is a mistake. . . . I was never among the 'adherents' of Mr. Calhoun. Our private relations were kind, but never intimate, and politically we were almost always opposed." Berrien MSS. In Gilmer's own copy of his book (now in the Emory University Library) which he revised for a new edition that was never published, this reference to Berrien is stricken out. Berrien was, of course, an old man at

has resulted from the simultaneous development of Jackson's controversy with Calhoun, and his quarrel with Ingham, Branch, and Berrien over the refusal of them and their families to entertain the wife of the Secretary of War. These unrelated episodes were both skillfully exploited by those who desired the elevation of Van Buren and the defeat of Calhoun, and Jackson was convinced, or convinced himself, that there was a direct and immediate connection between the two. That is, that the refusal of the families of Berrien, Branch, and Ingham to associate with Mrs. Eaton was a plot directed by Calhoun to force one of his opponents, Eaton, out of the cabinet.

This belief apparently has no basis in fact so far as Berrien was concerned.²⁷ He and Calhoun were almost always opposed to each other in politics. There are no letters between them in either of the published collections of Calhoun correspondence, and none in the Berrien papers. They were both opposed to the tariff and both their families refused to associate with Mrs. Eaton, but this coincidence is not sufficient to prove that they were political associates. There is no evidence that either was, at any time, interested in the political advancement of the other; in fact, Berrien was always opposed to those men in Georgia who desired the election of Calhoun to the presidency.

At the time of the dissolution of the cabinet Van Buren himself was not sure that Berrien was to be included among those whose resignations were to be requested.²⁸ Berrien was absent in Georgia on business connected with the Indians when the other members of the cabinet resigned. Edward Livingston, Levi Woodbury, Francis Scott Key, and Roger B. Taney, all to be closely associated with Jackson in his reorganized administration, were anxious that Berrien should be retained, as

this time, and his memory about specific events or happenings might be questioned, but it seems doubtful if he would make an error about the persons with whom he had or had not been politically associated.

²⁷ The writer has no concern here with whether there was ever a plot by any group to force Eaton out of the cabinet. In his opinion, however, the whole affair was purely social. It was directed entirely to the exclusion of Mrs. Eaton from society and was connected with politics only to the extent that it was used by the supporters of Van Buren.

²⁸ Benjamin F. Butler to Van Buren, April 22, 1831, Van Buren MSS.; *id.* to James A. Hamilton, April 25, 1831, in Hamilton, *Reminiscences*, 213-14.

they believed that his retention in the cabinet would be positive proof that the dissolution had not been caused by the Eaton affair.²⁹ Key was the only one who felt free to mention the subject to Jackson. The President, however, decisively rejected the suggestion, saying that Berrien's resignation "was a necessary part of the arrangement he had been compelled to make, and was understood as such, and that he could not go back from it."³⁰

Berrien probably would have been willing to remain in the cabinet. He knew that General Jackson's popularity was as great as ever in Georgia. His eulogy of Jackson and praise of his just and firm course in Indian affairs, delivered at a testimonial dinner to Berrien given by his friends in Savannah, had been well received in Georgia. He had just returned from the Indian country and he believed that a final solution of the whole controversy was to be arrived at in the course of a few months.³¹ It was only natural that he should want to be a participant in the triumphant end of a policy so popular in his own state and in which he had played so prominent a part. But he knew that it could not be. While in Savannah Berrien had received letters from Ingham stating that Jackson had expressly mentioned him as one of those who had to go.³² So when Key told him that it was not necessary for him to resign from the cabinet, "and that it would gratify some of the General's friends if he could be retained," Berrien merely indicated his belief that Van Buren "would have required that he should be included in the arrangement."³³

Berrien resigned on June 15. His resignation letter and its acknowledgement from the President were friendly in tone. He continued in his office until June 21 in order to prepare it for the reception of his successor. He then sent a brief note informing the President that he was ready to withdraw, and requesting Jackson's permission to publish the corre-

²⁹ Key to Taney, June 14, 1831, in Tyler, *Memoir of Taney*, 168-70; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, May 12, 1831; Macon *Georgia Messenger*, June 18, 1831.

³⁰ Key to Taney, June 14, 1831, in Tyler, *Memoir of Taney*, 169-70.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 169; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, May 19, 1831.

³² Ingham to Berrien, April 19, 20, 1831, Berrien MSS.

³³ Key to Taney, June 14, 1831, in Tyler, *Memoir of Taney*, 168.

spondence between them, because of the misunderstanding which had been circulated in the newspapers on the subject of his retirement from office.³⁴ This was granted. The correspondence appeared in due time and John Quincy Adams, writing in his diary, observed that Berrien was not only the single member of the cabinet that had gone out with dignity, but that he had also "treated the laws of grammar with some respect."

For a few weeks Berrien refrained from any participation in the public disputes between Eaton and the other members of the cabinet. Eaton addressed a note to him on June 17 enclosing a clipping from the Washington *Telegraph* that said, "it is proved that the Secretaries of the Treasury and of the Navy and the Attorney General refused to associate with her [Mrs. Eaton]."³⁵ In his note Eaton said: "This publication appears in a paper which professes to be friendly to you & is brought forth under your immediate eye. I desire to know of you, whether or not you sanction this statement or disavow it. The relation we have sustained towards each other authorizes me to demand an immediate answer."³⁵ Berrien replied the next day and denied the right of Eaton to interrogate him concerning the statements of the *Telegraph* or any other public journal which were made without his agency. Though denying Eaton's right, he wrote, he would not refuse to answer his inquiry, and thereupon Berrien gave a full account of his social relations with the Secretary of War and his wife.

At the time of Eaton's marriage, Berrien stated, he had not heard the rumors concerning Mrs. Eaton, nor had he known her relation to Washington society. He had been invited to the wedding and had attended with no distrust of the propriety of doing so. Later he learned of the allegations made against Mrs. Eaton, as they had become publicly and generally known, and it became necessary, even though embarrassing, for Berrien to determine his future conduct in view of the official relations existing between him and Major Eaton. In doing this, Berrien said, it did not seem to him necessary to decide on the truth or falsity of

³⁴ Berrien to Jackson, June 15, 21, 1831; Jackson to Berrien, June 15, 2, 1831, Berrien MSS.

³⁵ Eaton to Berrien, June 17, 1831, *ibid.*

these rumors. It was sufficient to ascertain the general sense of the community and act upon it. He had done so, and in the winter of 1830 he had been called upon by a gentleman (Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky), who had represented himself as acting upon the authority of the President. This gentleman had announced the regret that General Jackson felt at the lack of harmony or of social intercourse among the members of the cabinet, and his determination to have it. The fact had been distinctly stated to Berrien that he, Branch, and Ingham had all given large parties to which Mrs. Eaton was not invited, and he was told that in the future on such occasions the President would expect social intercourse among their families. Berrien replied that he would not permit the President or any other individual to dictate the social relations of himself or his family, and that if such a requisition were persisted in, he would retire from his official position.⁸⁶ The President, however, according to Berrien, in an interview a few days later disclaimed any disposition to press such a requisition, and Berrien closed his letter to Eaton with the statement, "I am not aware that any other occasion has occurred in which the question of an intercourse between your family and mine has been presented to me or my family."⁸⁷

Eaton replied to Berrien four days later: "I felt indisposed to believe that these attacks of General Green could be authorized by you or were under your sanction. Your declaration is evidence of the correctness of what I was before impressed with. I take occasion, therefore, with pleasure to acknowledge the frankness with which you have disavowed an agency in this nefarious business."⁸⁸ Jackson at the same time commented on this letter to both of his nephews from whom there was cer-

⁸⁶ Berrien could easily have resigned at this particular time, the winter of 1830, as George M. Troup, United States senator from Georgia, was anxious to resign his place and have Berrien succeed him. Berrien, however, advised against this, because he and other Georgians felt that at the particular stage of the Indian controversy the interests of Georgia could be better served by Troup remaining in the Senate and Berrien in the cabinet. Troup to Dr. W. C. Daniell, March 4, 1830, in Edward J. Harden, *The Life of George M. Troup* (Savannah, 1859), 508; Gilmer to Berrien, February 8, 1830, Berrien MSS.; Duff Green to Pemberton, editor of the Augusta *Chronicle*, August 5, 1831, Duff Green MSS. (This and other letters from the Duff Green MSS., owned by Miss Carrie Green, are used with the kind permission of Professor Fletcher M. Green.)

⁸⁷ Berrien to Eaton, June 18, 1831, in *Niles' Weekly Register*, XL (1831), 381-82.

⁸⁸ Eaton to Berrien, June 22, 1831, Berrien MSS.

tainly no need to conceal his true views concerning it. To Andrew Jackson, Jr., he wrote, "Judge Berrien has acted like a gentleman, and when his correspondence & Ingham's with Major Eaton are published the contrast will be damnation to Ingham and credit to Judge Berrien." And in a letter to Andrew Jackson Donelson, he said, "judge Berrien in his correspondence with Eaton has acted like a gentleman and left mr Ingham in rather a disagreeable situation."³⁹

Jackson did not change his opinion of Berrien's letter until July 19, although on July 11 he wrote to Van Buren that it was "a deep, *considered*, diplomatic letter."⁴⁰ On July 19, however, the Washington *Globe*, the administration paper, quoted a letter from Richard M. Johnson to Berrien which denied that Jackson had made any attempt to control the social intercourse of the members of his cabinet, or that he had authorized Colonel Johnson to make any such representation to them. Berrien seemed to feel that the article accompanying this quotation, which was confusingly written, indicated that he had also denied that the President had made any such attempt. He thereupon wrote a letter to Francis P. Blair, editor of the *Globe*, on the same day. He stated that he did not wish to enter into the controversy, nor did he believe that Colonel Johnson wanted to do so, but he indicated by implication that if he were forced into the public dispute that he would uphold the contentions of Branch and Ingham and of his original letter to Eaton.⁴¹ It was on this same day that Jackson wrote to Eaton, seemingly for the benefit of the record as they were both in Washington, a letter which said:

I have perused the note of judge Berrien to you (major Eaton) of the 18th of June and I regret, as he has referred to an interview with the President, that he has not given a fair statement, that you might understand (or if for publication) the public might understand it. first then I have to state, and do it without fear of contradiction that no member of Congress was by me ever authorised to say that Judge Berrien, Mr Ingham and Branch, with their families should associate with major Eaton and his or they should be removed. . . . all I wanted was har-

³⁹ Jackson to Andrew Jackson, Jr., June 23, 1831, Jackson MSS.; *id.* to Andrew J. Donelson, June 23, 1831, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 303.

⁴⁰ *Id.* to Van Buren, July 11, 1831, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 313.

⁴¹ Berrien to Francis P. Blair, July 19, 1831, Berrien MSS. The whole correspondence was printed in *Niles' Weekly Register*, XL (1831), 375-79.

mony in my Cabinet, that he and all others might rest assured that I never would part with major Eaton nor should he be drove out of my Cabinet by any combination that could or might be formed for that purpose, that I would remove the whole first—again it was repeated by the Gentlemen that they would be the last men who would do any act with a design, or knowledge, that it would injure major Eaton or his family—here the matter was left.⁴²

There is no need to enter here into a discussion of the long series of charges and countercharges that were made by Blair, Eaton, Johnson, and Jackson on the one side, and by Berrien, Branch, and Ingham on the other, nor to review the long correspondence that resulted from Eaton's challenge to Berrien on July 28, 1831. It is sufficient to say that both sides denied the truth of the assertions made by the other, and that it is impossible to ascertain which, if either, was correct. Berrien, however, did confine his public letters to an elaboration of his original letter to Eaton and the substantiation of it by corroborating evidence; and the fact that neither Jackson nor Eaton objected at the immediate time that the first statement of his position was received is an indication, at least, that there may have been some truth in it.

Berrien's personal break with the President was complete, but the question of his political affiliation was still unsettled. Jackson's popularity in Georgia was as great as ever, and the Troup and Clarke parties were vying with each other in their expressions of loyalty to the President in the gubernatorial campaign of 1831. Richard W. Habersham, close friend and political associate of Berrien, wrote him:

I have since I had the pleasure of seeing you in Savannah watched with a painful interest the course of events at Washington, for I apprehended that they must result in forcing you into the attitude into which you have been compelled to place yourself with regard to the President, an attitude which I knew would be harmful to you, and which would tend partly to increase the divisions and distractions of the great Southern party. I foresaw too, that under present [circumstances?] Georgia could not and would not take part with you, whatever might be the feeling of the [majority?] of her people towards you individually. The great body of the people of this State are devoted to the President for his course

⁴² Jackson to Eaton, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 163-64. This letter is filed in the Jackson MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), under the date of July 19, 1830, and is so dated by Bassett, but as it refers to Berrien's letter of June 18, 1831, there can be no doubt that it was written on July 19, 1831.

in relation to the Indians and Indian lands, the acts of his administration whether as they regard to our domestic or foreign relations have been generally approved and that approbation has been loudly and often expressed in all our journals. Any opposition which should now show itself would be compelled (to relieve itself of inconsistency) to rest itself upon the single ground of the recent dissolution of the cabinet, and in our state would be almost compelled to confine itself to the wrongs and injustice which has been done to one of our citizens. But even if opposition could show itself at another time with hope of success, it could not, if made at present, end otherwise than in the political death of all concerned. The whole state is warmly excited on the subject of the approaching elections. . . . The great weapon of either party is the charge of want of attachment to the President and of preference for Calhoun. . . . To prove the correctness of these views it is only necessary to refer to the columns of the prints throughout the State. The Troup party rest themselves on their unchanging and jealous support of the President, the Clark party claims to have been his original friends. It is evident enough to me that many of the leaders of this last party are friendly to Mr. Calhoun [whom?] they cannot touch. . . . All that can now be done . . . [is] to place you on the footing which is the fact that you have been forced into the disclosures which you have made; that . . . you did not volunteer to do the injury, but was forced in self defense and to point out as often as [opportunity?] arises the zeal with which you have devoted yourself whether in or out of office to the interests of the state and particularly your services on the Indian question.⁴³

Fortunately Berrien was a delegate to the National Free Trade Convention at Philadelphia in October, 1831, and, consequently, had an excuse to remain away from Georgia and out of the gubernatorial campaign of that year. His friend Gilmer was the candidate of one faction of the Troup party for re-election, Thomas Haynes of the other faction, and Wilson Lumpkin had been nominated by the Clarke party. The always tangled political situation in Georgia was more complex than usual. All the candidates claimed to be loyal to Andrew Jackson, none more loudly than Lumpkin, a personal friend of Calhoun.⁴⁴ Haynes finally withdrew from the race in September, but the factionalism in the Troup party was not healed, and Lumpkin was elected governor.

The split in the Troup party became even wider as John Forsyth, by this time one of the most influential advisers of the Jackson administra-

⁴³ Richard W. Habersham to Berrien, August 3, 1831, Berrien MSS.

⁴⁴ Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights*, 125; Lumpkin, *Removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia*, II, 297-98.

tion, and the papers under his control, began to attack Berrien as a supporter of Calhoun and an enemy of Jackson.⁴⁵ Duff Green, anxious as always to promote the interests of Calhoun, tried to persuade the leaders of the Clarke party to take advantage of the split between Forsyth on the one hand and Gilmer and Berrien on the other. On August 5 he wrote:

I say to you that Jackson cannot be elected. I cannot mistake your feelings, and I know enough of Judge Berrien to know that you would sustain him, if you knew all that I know. A division is about to take place in the Troup party—and by prudence you will control the state. Nothing but the pressure from the Clarke party keeps it together; and if you would permit them to quarrel you would soon find the two divisions of the old Crawford party now one. When this comes Judge Berrien, Troup and Gilmer will be on your side. Is it not wise in you to promote it?⁴⁶

Green warned the members of the Clarke party that Jackson would ignore them, as he had in the past, and "throw himself upon Crawford, Forsyth and the Journal." If, however, the Clarke party would defend Berrien he would have to join it from hostility to Forsyth, and his strength was still sufficient to pull most of the Gilmer wing of the Troup party with him. In this way, Green said, the Clarke party would be able to dominate state politics.⁴⁷

Green correctly saw the divisions in Georgia politics, but he underestimated the strength of Jackson's popularity. No one in the Clarke party dared to break with the President, and the Clarke papers continued to oppose both factions of the Troup party. In fact, as late as September 3, 1831, the Macon *Telegraph*, a Clarke paper, said of the Calhoun-Crawford controversy, "It is no more than one political blackleg palming a card on the other," and referred to both Berrien and Forsyth as "warm and devoted friends of Crawford."

Green was also wrong when he predicted that Berrien would not support Jackson for re-election. Berrien's knowledge of the political situation in Georgia was too great, and Habersham's warning had been too explicit, for him to dare to break politically with the administration.

⁴⁵ Green to J. A. Cuthbert, July 24, 1831, Duff Green MSS.; William H. Torrance to Berrien, August 13, 1831, Berrien MSS.

⁴⁶ Green to Pemberton, editor of the Augusta *Chronicle*, August 5, 1831, Duff Green MSS.

⁴⁷ *Id* to *id.*, August 5, 1831; *id.* to Cuthbert, July 24, 1831, *ibid.*

Soon after he returned to Georgia he was invited to attend a dinner in honor of Gilmer at Milledgeville. He was called on to speak, and in reference to the dissolution of the cabinet and its aftermath, he said:

I look to these events, rather in sorrow, as one of this people . . . than in anger as an individual. I have no private griefs to urge . . . personally I prefer no complaint. . . . In reference to the Chief Magistrate of the Union, I have no disposition to retract the sentiments which in full view of the events which speedily followed, were sometimes since expressed to my fellow citizens of Savannah. . . . On a question of public policy deeply interesting to us as a people, he has been, and is, a friend of Georgia. His conduct on that occasion entitled him to the gratitude of her people. It commanded and still commands mine.

Berrien endorsed Jackson's efforts to maintain the rights of the state and to repress undue exertion of Federal power, and approved his strong foreign policy and the economy with which he had conducted the general government. He then closed his speech with the following statement: "These measures of his administration have heretofore received and will continue to receive my cordial concurrence. . . . They will find much more able support than I can give . . . but I will yield to none in the sincerity with which I will endeavor to sustain them."⁴⁸

Berrien took little part in the campaign of 1832 as his primary interest at the time was the question of the tariff. He, Albert Gallatin, and Langdon Cheves had been the leaders of discussion at the National Free Trade Convention, and Berrien had prepared the address of the convention to the people of the United States.⁴⁹ Upon his return to Georgia he had become one of the leaders of the antitariff movement in the state and he devoted most of his time and energy to this subject. In the summer of 1832, as was the usual custom, the leading politicians of the state gathered at Athens for the commencement exercises of the University of Georgia. A meeting was held, presided over by William H. Crawford, to consider the problem of the tariff. The organizers of the meeting were largely men of moderate views and opposed to any drastic action, but Augustine S. Clayton, Augustus B. Longstreet, and Berrien secured control of its proceedings. They decided to call a convention in Novem-

⁴⁸ Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, November 17, 1831.

⁴⁹ Niles' *Weekly Register*, XLI (1831), 105-107, 136-41, 156-68.

ber at Milledgeville to which the counties of the state were invited to send delegates. Crawford did not entirely approve of the action of the meeting, but he signed the resolutions as presiding officer, and the call for the convention went out in his name.⁵⁰

The Troup and Clarke parties had both nominated Andrew Jackson for re-election, and, as a result, the campaign of 1832 was receiving comparatively little attention in Georgia. The Clarke party, no longer friendly to Calhoun⁵¹ though still hostile to Van Buren, had nominated Phillip Barbour for vice-president. Barbour, however, refused the nomination, and, consequently, both parties in Georgia were supporting the same candidates. The anttariff convention furnished them an issue, however, and the Clarke press immediately denounced the men who called it as nullifiers and opponents of Andrew Jackson. This was denied by Berrien and the other callers of the convention, who insisted that there was no connection between the convention and the opposition to Jackson.⁵²

In a sense this was correct. All of these men were nominally support-

⁵⁰ Macon *Georgia Messenger*, August 9, 1832.

⁵¹ A strange situation had developed in Georgia out of the complications of state politics, personal loyalties, national and sectional questions, and economic issues. The friends of Calhoun in Georgia, among whom, incidentally, were many of the defenders of the Bank of the United States against the state banks, were the most fervent and loyal supporters of President Jackson, and were opposed to any drastic action in regard to the tariff. They could not maintain this anomalous position long and broke with Calhoun after his open declaration in favor of nullification. This situation is clearly shown in a letter from Dr. Tomlinson Fort, president of the Central Bank of Georgia, to Calhoun on July 15, 1831, which said: "The fiery ordeal you have so triumphantly passed through in the late correspondence; the developments which have followed the dissolution of the late cabinet; the position you contemplate taking before the people in what I think a far more dangerous trial . . . operate to cause me to obtrude myself on your notice at the present time. I can hardly be mistaken in the fact that, a wide spread opinion prevails, that there is at work in South Carolina a powerful passion of disloyalty to the Government of the United States. . . . The Troup party of this state have recoiled from the consequences of maxims. Few of them daring to avow their faith in nullification. Their opponents, with whom I am classed, always loyal to the Government of the United States, are kindled into intense passion on the question. . . . I have urged on many of them the necessity of avowing our purpose of supporting you at the proper time or at least to prepare the public mind for such a course. They almost uniformly reply by asking, *is he not a nullifier?* It will be impossible to unite them in support of anyone who is tainted with nullification. No! not even against Mr. Van buren, odious as he is." Fort MSS.

⁵² Macon *Georgia Messenger*, August 27, 1832; Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, Au-gust 30, 1832.

ing Jackson for re-election, and public sentiment in Georgia was such that if they had admitted that secretly almost all of them were desirous of the defeat of Jackson, it would have meant their political eclipse and the failure of their convention. Berrien was always very careful to distinguish between his position in regard to the tariff and the nullification doctrines of Calhoun in South Carolina. He said that he believed in measures of resistance based on the doctrine of state rights as expressed in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, such as had been put into force by Governor Troup and the Georgia legislature in their resistance to the Federal government from 1825 to 1827. He opposed nullification, because, he said:

An exercise of the reserved right of the state by the annulment or nullification of the obnoxious law, if such a power could be deduced from the Constitution of the United States or could be considered as fairly incident to State Sovereignty, during the continuance of the confederacy, would merit consideration; but with great respect for the intelligence and the fullest confidence in the patriotism of many of those by whom it is advocated, I have been led to the conclusion that it is impracticable, and that its tendency will be to precipitate a result, which all would unite to deplore.⁵³

Despite his denials of any connection with nullification, the charge was repeated, and some of Berrien's friends were convinced that his secret anxiety to prevent the re-election of General Jackson had caused him to lean even further towards nullification than he himself realized.⁵⁴ That Berrien was opposed to the re-election of Jackson is indicated by a letter of July 17, 1832, to a friend in Philadelphia:

I am advised of the Presidential veto on the Bank bills—This presents a crisis in our affairs which gives more than ordinary interest to the prospect before us—You are not ignorant of my views on this subject. The hope of a renewal of the charter is now limited to the failure of Genl Jackson's reelection or to the acquisition of such an accession of strength in Congress as will enable its friends to present a case too strong for his opposition. It would be extremely desirable, if it were practicable to obtain a favorable expression of opinion from the Legislatures of the different States—or failing this to prevent legislative instructions to the Senators. This is more important in this state, where a change in the Senatorial branch will probably occur at the next session of Congress—A very general

⁵³ Macon *Georgia Messenger*, October 4, 1832.

⁵⁴ Hunter to Biddle, August 6, 1832, Biddle MSS.

assemblage of persons of influence from different parts of the state, takes place at Athens in the beginning of August. . . . I have determined to go there and knowing that Col Hunter the Cashier of the Branch at this place, has considerable influence with a very powerful party in this State [the Clarke party], I have advised him to do so. . . . The object of this letter is therefore to suggest thro you to Mr. Biddle, the propriety of his giving instruction to Col. Hunter on this subject.⁵⁵

Berrien could not let this opposition be known, for he was anxious to be the one selected to go to the Senate by the next legislature, and he continued to insist publicly that he was a supporter of Jackson.

All during August, September, and October, Berrien traveled over the state trying to arouse interest in the coming antitariff convention. The citizens of Chatham, Berrien's home county, refused to send a delegate, and he had to go to Milledgeville as the representative of Monroe, one of the newer counties of the interior of the state.⁵⁶ When the convention met on November 13, 1832, a number of moderates, led by Forsyth, attempted to obstruct the convention and prevent it from taking any action. They were defeated in this purpose, withdrew, and organized as a separate body. Judge Clayton led the small group among the remaining delegates that actually favored nullification, but the majority held approximately the same views as those advanced by Berrien, and they refused to permit the nullifiers to control the convention. Resolutions were adopted condemning the tariff and calling a convention of all the Southern states, which should consult on the proper mode of redress and then refer its action back to the people of the several states for ratification.⁵⁷

No Southern convention was held as the whole question was settled by the compromise tariff of 1833; but the state convention was not without practical results, for it served to clarify the confused political situation in Georgia. Forsyth, Crawford, and their faction of the Troup party marched right out of the antitariff convention into the Clarke party to form the Union or administration party in Georgia. On the other hand Gilmer, Berrien, Troup, and Clayton, emboldened by the opposition in

⁵⁵ Berrien to Phillip H. Nicklin, July 17, 1832, *ibid.*

⁵⁶ Milledgeville *Southern Recorder*, November 1, 15, 1832.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, November 15, 22, 1832; Macon *Georgia Messenger*, November 15, 22, December 13, 1832.

Georgia to the principles of national supremacy on which were based Jackson's proclamation to the people of South Carolina and the Force bill, came out openly against the administration under the banner of state rights.⁵⁸ The Indian problem had been settled. No longer was there an imperative need for unanimity among Georgians in national affairs, and the natural division of the state into rich and poor, commercial and agrarian, became dominant in national as well as local politics. It was only a question of time until the State Rights party became the Whig party, and Berrien and other conservative, commercial men of Georgia found allies in men of similar interests in other sections of the country.

⁵⁸ Hunter to Biddle, November 18, 1832, Biddle MSS.; Macon *Georgia Messenger*, December 20, 1832; January 14, August 24, 30, 1833.

The Relations Between Judah P. Benjamin and Jefferson Davis:

SOME NEW LIGHT ON THE WORKING
OF THE CONFEDERATE MACHINE

By ROBERT DOUTHAT MEADE

During the Civil War¹ it used to be said that Judah P. Benjamin and Mrs. Jefferson Davis "ran the machine at Richmond."² The statement has delicious implications. Even a professional Southerner should be amused at the thought of Benjamin, a Sephardic Jew born in the West Indies, and Varina Howell of the Yankee Howells³ running the new government set up by the proud Southern gentry.

Like many such gossipy sayings, this one is only partly true. The actual extent of Mrs. Davis's power is left to be determined by a historian with sufficient experience in the methods by which some of the so-called weaker sex influence their life partners. The field which we propose to enter in the present study is more tangible, more subject to the ordinary rules of historical evidence. It is the relationship between Benjamin and Davis and its connection with the result of the Civil War. This subject the writer will treat in some detail, emphasizing aspects not generally familiar to the war historians.

It is hardly necessary to point out how much we still have to learn about the little inner circle of men who ran the Confederate machine.

¹ This paper was read at a joint session of the American Historical Association and the Southern Historical Association in Chicago, December 30, 1938, and has subsequently been slightly revised.

² John W. Burgess, *Reminiscences of an American Scholar* (New York, 1934), 291.

³ Mrs. Davis's father was William Burr Howell, son of Richard Howell, Revolutionary governor of New Jersey. W. L. Whittlesey, "Richard Howell," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), IX, 304.

Some excellent writing has been done on this subject, particularly in recent years. But the glamour of the gory side of war still lures many scholars into the study of insignificant skirmishes and minor brigadiers. The result is that to some of them such key men in the Richmond administration as George Wythe Randolph, James A. Seddon, and Lucius B. Northrop are little more than names. They know that these two Secretaries of War and the Commissary General held positions of vital importance to the Confederacy but are unable to give adequate appraisements of their work.

In the case of Judah P. Benjamin there is a similar lack of basic information. The Civil War historians have presented ample evidence that the bland, smiling little lawyer from cosmopolitan New Orleans had more influence with Jefferson Davis than any other Confederate. But important questions which remain are: In what fields was Benjamin's influence most significant? What was its nature and extent? By answering these queries we can explain many obscure yet momentous phases of Confederate history.

To begin with, it should be confessed that we are faced with a difficult task. We have not only to trace the footsteps of an important historical figure who worked "as few men have before or since" but to explain a subtle and often highly complex character. We can easily prove that Benjamin was the only genius in the Confederate cabinet. We can demonstrate that his career, with its American and English phases, was more glamorous than that of any other prominent Confederate. But we are still confronted with one perplexing problem: Judah P. Benjamin was an enigmatic figure—the most incomprehensible of all the Confederate leaders. Lee, Jackson, even Jefferson Davis, are crystal clear in comparison with the Jewish lawyer and statesman. The acrimonious dispute about his character began before the Civil War and has not ceased to this day.

Born at St. Croix⁴ of Spanish Jewish parents, Judah Philip Benjamin spent his early youth in the Carolinas, attended Yale, and at the age of

⁴ Data in birth certificate sent to the writer by Moses Sasso, Reader of the Hebrew Congregation at Saint Thomas. Benjamin's birthplace is sometimes erroneously given as Saint Thomas instead of Saint Croix.

seventeen went to New Orleans to seek his fortune. In the great entrepôt of the Mississippi Valley he rose to be one of the leading lawyers at an able bar, a state legislator, and member of two state constitutional conventions. Elected to the United States Senate and performing with distinction the duties of his office, he still found time to placate local spoils-men, to help promote a railroad on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec, to represent in Ecuador the purported owner of guano interests in the Galapagos Islands, to make almost annual trips abroad, and to argue more cases before the United States Supreme Court than almost any other American lawyer. In short, Benjamin was not a Southerner of the provincial type but the sophisticated and none too squeamish representative of the new capitalism in the booming Louisiana port. Although conservative in matters of property rights, he was in some respects quite progressive. Above all, he was not the man "to die of an abstraction," as Henry A. Wise had feared would be the fate of Old Virginia.

Such was the bizarre figure whom Davis selected as attorney general of the new Confederacy. Since Benjamin had been a prominent member of the Southern party in the Senate, it might be assumed that the appointment to the cabinet had followed a prewar intimacy. But this was not the case. Benjamin and Davis had had little social intercourse before 1861 and had once been on the verge of a duel.⁵ Nor was the appointment made because of any pronounced predilection on Benjamin's part for secession and the formation of a new government. During the months preceding the withdrawal of South Carolina from the Union he was absorbed in a lucrative mining case. This required his presence in California, and he did not sail for the East coast until four days after Lincoln's election.⁶ He entered into secession reluctantly and, it seems, largely from reasons of expediency. In a confidential conversation on January 21, 1861, he is reported to have stated that the ablest of the secession leaders "really regard the experiment of a new Confederation as an effectual means of bringing the conservative masses of the North-

⁵ Mrs. Jefferson Davis to Francis Lawley, April 4, 1897, and other data in Lawley MSS. Courtesy of the owner, Pierce Butler of New Orleans, Louisiana.

⁶ He left San Francisco on the *Sonora*, bound for Panama, November 10, 1860. California dispatch to the *New York Times*, November 28, 1860.

ern people to realize the necessity of revising radically the instrument of union."⁷

Jefferson Davis must have had some inkling of Benjamin's real feeling about secession. He knew that the former Louisiana Senator was reluctant to accept the cabinet position. But this did not prevent him from securing Benjamin's services. Davis later stated that he selected Benjamin because of his "very high reputation" as a lawyer and the impression formed in the Senate of his ability and habits of industry.⁸ Doubtless he was also influenced by the desire to have a Louisianan in the cabinet.

The appointment was a mistake. As H. J. Eckenrode has pointed out, Davis should have sent Benjamin abroad with enough money to win over the European chancelleries.⁹ The attorney-generalship was too insignificant a position for Benjamin. His official duties were chiefly of a routine nature, and could have little effect on the results of the war. At a cabinet meeting in Montgomery, however, he did suggest that the Confederate government buy a large quantity of cotton, at least a hundred thousand bales, and ship it to England where the proceeds could be used to purchase munitions and to supply credit. But the cabinet laughed at Benjamin's fear of a serious war, and Davis did not attempt to carry out his plan.¹⁰

After this rebuff we have no evidence that Benjamin made any further proposals while attorney general which might have changed the course of the war. But the period of his tenure in this office was a fruitful time during which he studied Davis's character and ingratiated himself with him. High-minded as Davis was in most respects, we know that he was thin-skinned and at times even suspicious in his relations with others. On occasions he could be quite obstinate. No man could hold a position in

⁷ *North American Review* (Boston, New York, 1815-), CXXIX (1879), 134.

⁸ "Mr. Benjamin, of Louisiana, had a very high reputation as a lawyer, and my acquaintance with him in the Senate had impressed me with the lucidity of his intellect, his systematic habits and capacity for labor. He was therefore invited to the post of Attorney-General." Jefferson Davis, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*, 2 vols. (New York, 1881), I, 242.

⁹ Conversation with the writer.

¹⁰ Pierce Butler, *Judah P. Benjamin* (Philadelphia, 1906), 233-34.

the cabinet without submitting to the dominance of the President, as the able George Wythe Randolph was to learn to his sorrow.¹¹ This quality in Davis's character Benjamin seems to have quickly perceived. He decided to offer suggestions when he felt he could do so without causing undue offense, but he would not lay his head on the block. If Davis required him to pursue a policy which was against his best judgment, he would do so loyally and efficiently and hope for the best. At the same time he would seek means to increase his influence with the President. Robert Barnwell Rhett, a hostile critic, later wrote of Benjamin, "A man of great fertility of mind and resource, and of facile character, he was the factotum of the President, performed his bidding in various ways, and gave him the benefit of his brains in furtherance of the views of Mr. Davis."¹² There is much truth in Rhett's statement but it does not tell the entire story. Benjamin was the chief factotum of the President. He never dominated Davis. But by adapting himself to Davis's character and making himself extremely useful he did before the end of 1861 succeed in becoming the President's most influential adviser.

On September 17, 1861, Benjamin was appointed secretary of war.¹³ This was then the most important position in the cabinet. During the next six months he devoted all his great talents to securing enough men, ammunition, and supplies to prepare for the expected Northern offensive. Working long hours, even apparently on Sundays and holidays,¹⁴ he put his department on an efficient basis from which all his successors benefited. Jefferson Davis directed all the military affairs even to the extent of approving minor appointments. But Benjamin removed from Davis's shoulders an immense load of detail, and, ever loyal and uncomplaining, was a bulwark of strength in the President's mounting

¹¹ Information from Randolph's grandnephew, General Jefferson Randolph Kean of Washington, D. C. See, also, Robert D. Meade, "George Wythe Randolph," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, XV, 358-59.

¹² Robert U. Johnson and Clarence C. Buel (eds.), *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, 4 vols. (New York, 1887-1888), I, 105.

¹³ He was acting secretary of war until November 12, 1861, and the regular incumbent until March 18, 1862.

¹⁴ In one of his letters while secretary of war, Benjamin specifically stated that he was writing on Sunday. There is also other evidence indicating that he did an enormous amount of labor beyond normal working hours.

difficulties. He saw clearly the problems of the South as a whole and made a strenuous effort to prevent dispersion of men and materials to nonessential places.

The historians have generally agreed, however, that Benjamin proved a failure as war minister. Their verdict is just. He lacked sufficient tact and knowledge of military procedure to deal with sensitive generals, and he could not handle phases of his work requiring detailed military knowledge. But we do not appreciate how much he was blamed for actions taken at Davis's request, or how often he was really fighting the President's battles. For example, Benjamin was severely censured for the quarrel that nearly precipitated the resignation of "Stonewall" Jackson. But tucked away in one of Benjamin's letters in the *Official Records* is a statement that "at the President's instance" he had issued the order which so infuriated Jackson.¹⁵ During his bitter quarrels with Joseph E. Johnston, P. G. T. Beauregard, and Henry A. Wise, Benjamin was really taking up the gage for Davis.

By March, 1862, there was a strong popular demand for Benjamin's removal. General Johnston, who then commanded the main Confederate army in the East, stated at a dinner party in Richmond attended by several high officials, that the Confederacy could not succeed while Benjamin remained secretary of war.¹⁶ His conduct of the Roanoke Island affair was investigated by a hostile committee of the Confederate Congress. But Davis made him secretary of state in the very teeth of the criticism. To quote from a letter written by Mrs. Davis many years later, "The President promoted him with a personal and aggrieved sense of the injustice done to the man who had become his friend and right hand."¹⁷

When Benjamin assumed the duties of secretary of state in March, 1862, the rapprochement was complete. Davis and Benjamin were now working hand in glove, and the harassed President relied on the Secre-

¹⁵ *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. V, 1059.

¹⁶ Henry S. Foote, *War of the Rebellion; or, Scylla and Charybdis* (New York, 1866), 356-57.

¹⁷ Lawley MSS.

tary of State as he did on no other man. In the absence of revealing data from Davis, another quotation is made from the account written by his wife:

Mr. Benjamin was always ready for work, sometimes with half an hour's recess he remained with the Executive from ten in the morning until nine at night and together they traversed all the difficulties which encompassed our beleaguered land. . . . Both the President and the Secretary worked like galley slaves, early and late, Mr. Davis came home fasting, a mere mass of throbbing nerves, and perfectly exhausted; but Mr. Benjamin was always fresh and buoyant. One day I asked him what kept him up and he said, "I always carry to these long cabinet meetings a small cake which I eat when I begin to feel fatigued and it freshens me up at once." There was one striking peculiarity about his temperament. No matter what disaster befel[1] our arms after he had done all in his power to prevent or rectify it, he was never depressed. No reverse tortured him exceedingly, as it did Mr. Davis, who though he was too reticent and self-controlled to betray his anguish suffered like one in torment. Mr. Benjamin was serenely cheerful, played games, jested and talked as wittily as usual. His demeanour puzzled us so much that at last I asked him what comfort came to him? Was he hopeful of a fortunate termination? He said he believed there was a fate in the destiny of nations, and it was wrong and useless to distress one's self and thus weaken one's energy to bear what was foreordained to happen.¹⁸

The testimony of L. Q. Washington, the assistant secretary of state, and of numerous others substantiates this evidence of the intimate relationship between Benjamin and Davis. To this day the historians have never been able to determine to what extent each man was responsible for the Confederate policies. In attempting to do so, the writer realizes that he is entering upon treacherous ground. He does feel, however, that it is possible to reach certain definite conclusions.

We can safely assume that Benjamin did not exert a very salutary influence in military affairs. He had learned much while secretary of war. But, as is sometimes the case with men who have unusually quick minds, he overestimated the depth of the knowledge he had acquired. We have an excellent illustration of this weakness in a letter he wrote to Davis after the war. Referring to the removal of General Joseph E. Johnston from the command of the army in front of Atlanta, Benjamin stated that he "was most anxious for his removal at a much earlier

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

date."¹⁹ Benjamin seems to have retained the layman's conception of military strategy.

Benjamin also failed to bring Davis needed political strength among the Southern people. A politician who talked to Benjamin in 1861 spoke of him as having "a distinctly French turn of thought." However much Benjamin may have been at home in New Orleans, he did not speak the language of the average Southerner. Many did not understand him and some actively disliked him. The descendant of a Confederate general says that the name of Benjamin is still "anathema" in his family. Undoubtedly, Benjamin increased the feeling of separation between the Davis administration and the masses of the people.

But if Benjamin was not omnipotent and omniscient as his apologists would have us believe, he was the one man in the administration most likely to make the break with the past that was needed to win the war. Years before, in Louisiana, he had learned to appreciate the political axiom that half a loaf is better than no bread. Even before he left the war office he told Reuben Davis that he was willing to have peace under the condition that each party keep the territory then under its control. The North could have all the territory in Tennessee north of the Memphis and Charleston Railroad. Reuben Davis was astounded and told Benjamin that if the South could hope for no better result he would rather go back into the Union without further bloodshed.²⁰

In his diplomatic relations with England and France Benjamin gave further proof of his coolly practical viewpoint toward Confederate problems. For this phase of his work he was almost ideally equipped by training and temperament, and Davis usually gave him a free hand, at least within certain limits. Unfortunately, Benjamin was seriously handicapped by the difficulties of communication with Europe. But it seems safe to attribute to his fine hand rather than to Davis the tempting proposal made to Louis Napoleon in the early part of 1862. Benjamin offered the Emperor one hundred thousand or more bales of cotton and the right to introduce French products into the South "for a certain de-

¹⁹ Judah P. Benjamin to Jefferson Davis, February 15, 1879, in Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, 10 vols. (Jackson, Miss., 1923), VIII, 355-56.

²⁰ Reuben Davis, *Recollections of Mississippi and Mississippians* (Boston, 1891), 431-32.

fined period" if he would recognize the Confederacy or break the blockade.²¹ After receiving this offer Napoleon made a determined effort to aid the South but could not secure British co-operation.

After Lincoln had issued his Emancipation Proclamation, it became clear that the South could not secure British recognition without "dishing" slavery. We know that near the end of the war Benjamin used his great influence to secure Davis's support for the proposal to arm the slaves and let them fight for their freedom. Furthermore, Benjamin's friend and messmate in Richmond, Duncan Kenner of Louisiana, was sent to Europe to offer emancipation in return for British recognition. These desperate proposals came too late. But a study of Benjamin's character and of his attitude toward the Negro problem leads one to believe that he would have favored emancipation a year or more earlier if he had felt Davis and the Southern people were ready for the measure.²²

There is ample evidence to prove that Benjamin was a very strong if not controlling force in the relations between the Richmond government and the Confederate agents in Canada and the North. He was also Davis's right-hand man in his negotiations with the two Northern emissaries, John R. Gilmore and James Jaquess, and in preparing the instructions for the Hampton Roads commissioners. It is worthy of mention that Benjamin is reported to have urged Davis to place Gilmore and Jaquess in Castle Thunder until after the Northern election, so that they could not influence the voters.

During the last desperate months of the war Benjamin hinted at the need for a dictatorship if the South could win by no other means. But we may presume that he wanted Davis, not Lee, to be the dictator. In February, 1865, Benjamin made a stirring speech in Richmond during which he publicly advocated arming of the slaves and stated that he would never surrender as long as a drop of blood flowed in his veins. During this final period he was bitterly attacked. On February 21 he

²¹ Benjamin to John Slidell, April 12, 1862, in *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion*, 30 vols. (Washington, 1894-1919), Ser. II, Vol. III, 387.

²² References to source material which are not supplied in this study will be given in a biography of Benjamin which the writer is now completing.

wrote a letter to Davis offering to resign if this action would rid him of embarrassment. To the best of the writer's knowledge this letter has never been published, and its text is inserted to show certain truly noble qualities in the man:

Confidential

My dear Sir

Department of State

Richmond 21 February 1865

I have been recently disturbed in mind on a subject which I can no longer refrain from placing frankly before you—

It is unnecessary to remind you that I accepted office with reluctance and have retained it solely from a sense of duty—Separated from my family for nearly five years past, my eager desire to see them has been repressed by the belief that my services were not without value to you: and I knew how impossible it was for any human being to sustain the burthen now weighing on you, without zealous and cordial aid—

For some months past however I have doubted whether my withdrawal from office would not rather promote the success of your administration than deprive you of useful assistance—It has been apparent that I have been the object of concerted and incessant assault by those who are inimical to me personally, as well as by all in Congress and the press that are hostile to you—These attacks have been regarded by me with entire indifference, except as suggesting the doubt above expressed—if our affairs were in a more prosperous condition, I should tender my resignation unconditionally, confident that if found desirable it would be in my power to return to your assistance in the Legislative Department of the Government—But in the present juncture I shrink from giving Color for an instant to the suspicion of a desire to shield myself from danger or responsibility by abandonment of duty—

I must therefore beg you to let me know your own conclusion with entire unreserve—Will your administration be strengthened or any opposition to it disarmed by substituting another in my place in the Cabinet?

If so, I will at once seek the sphere of duty above referred to, in which I know I can be serviceable in sustaining you in this great struggle—if not, I shall cheerfully continue the sacrifice of private inclination and family affection to the call of duty, at all hazards, and under all responsibilities—

I am with entire regard and respect

Your friend & obt st

To the President

J. P. BENJAMIN

Benjamin accompanied Davis in his flight southward after the fall of Richmond. At a cabinet meeting in Greensboro he was the only member who supported Davis in his determination to continue the war but he soon realized the futility of further resistance. After he had

escaped to London he continued his cordial relations with the former President. In a letter to the London *Times* he paid a high tribute to Davis's character. Later, he wrote Davis that although he would defend him against aspersions on his character he would not become involved in controversies regarding the Confederacy. That stormy period of his life was a closed chapter. "I freely confess that it is not agreeable to mix in any way in controversies of the past which for me are buried forever."²⁸ It was such sentiments that led some of Benjamin's enemies to accuse him of lack of deep feeling. But Jefferson Davis trusted him utterly. He wrote to the London *Times* some years after the war that he had learned to know Benjamin better perhaps than any other living man and added, "neither in private conversation nor in Cabinet council have I heard him utter one unworthy thought, one ungenerous sentiment." Davis told a Confederate veteran with whom the writer talked that he considered Benjamin the ablest member of his cabinet; that his career in England after the war justified his estimate of him.

Although the only genius in the Confederate cabinet, Benjamin was not infallible. Evidence which has been secured from a large mass of unpublished material as well as from the obvious sources proves that there were several dubious episodes in his career. He was given to quixotic enthusiasms and was sometimes too cocksure of his knowledge. But Benjamin was possessed of keen intellect, high courage, and rare qualities of devotion and self-sacrifice. He had a cosmopolitan background and wide practical experience, and viewed Confederate problems with a cool detachment. He knew from the beginning that the South was faced with a serious war, and was willing to take the radical steps necessary to obtain victory over heavy obstacles. He broke away from the theory of King Cotton and was even willing to "dish" slavery when he felt the war could be won by no other means. He was a bulwark of strength for the Confederate President, and during the last three years of the war was his most influential adviser. Davis was strong-minded to the last, and never gave him a free hand. But making the best of the opportunities that he had, Benjamin proved himself one of the coolest and most dangerous revolutionists whom the North had to face.

²⁸ Rowland (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, VIII, 356.

The Indian Frontier in South Carolina as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary

By FRANK J. KLINGBERG

The anthropologist and the ethnologist, latecomers in the study of native peoples, owe much to the missionary, who was often the sole pioneer observer. Darwin acknowledged this debt again and again in his observations during his five-year voyage in the *Beagle*. The missionary, although intent upon his own definite objectives, carried with him not only ideas of farming and of medicine, for example, but inevitably was the representative of European civilization in its many aspects. He naturally included in his reports much of value to later natural and social scientists,¹ however loud their complaints at times may be that the churchman altered pure laboratory material by his virile intervention with new ideas and ideals. Gathering invaluable bodies of information and carrying out their missionary and educational programs, the two venerable Anglican societies, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, have built up traditions of dealing with primitive peoples and cultures. The modern missionary in his tremendous task of building a new ideology upon old fabrics no longer speaks of aboriginal customs as "superstitions" or devil's tales, but is more content to infiltrate the essentials of Christianity and Western culture into the vast varieties of non-European civilizations. The present missionary aim is to "'absorb all that is best in western culture into a culture evolved from all that is best in African life,'"² or other native civilization.

¹ A discussion of the missionary as an explorer may be found in Heinrich Vedder, *South West Africa in Early Times*, trans. and ed. by Cyril G. Hall (London, 1938), 183.

² Denys W. T. Shropshire, *The Church and Primitive Peoples* (London, 1938), quoted in the London *Times*, *Literary Supplement*, September 3, 1938, p. 564.

The training of native leaders, a chief aim in modern times, was an objective early visualized in the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in South Carolina. It has not always been easily seen that even the native teacher must be encouraged to appreciate the traditional values of his own society. It is therefore remarkable to find a man of the genius and vision of the Frenchman, Dr. Francis Le Jau, who found the Indians with qualities that shamed him as a Christian. Many of his observations made during his work in South Carolina would be "advanced" for the present day and suggest that intelligence is timeless and that a man may appear well ahead of his age. He and his fellow workers, at times naïve, dogmatic, narrow, or inspired, recorded the contemporary scene of early South Carolina and gave eyewitness reports of frontier conditions.

According to the missionaries' letters of the period, beginning about 1702, the Creek, Cherokee, and Yamassee were the most numerous of the Indian tribes of South Carolina, although the Savannah, Ittiwan, Apalachi, Chickasaw, and others were represented.³ The majority of the Indians, except those who were slaves, were far removed from the English settlements, and could be reached only by difficult journeys over treacherous trails. The language difficulty was another barrier which the missionaries struggled to remove. The trader's commercial vocabulary was inadequate for the purposes of religious teaching and even this limited knowledge he could not, or perhaps would not, transmit to the missionaries. Dr. Le Jau, writing in 1711, complained of the trader's resistance to appeals: "I will take great pains to get those several dialects. . . . I only complain of the dullness and laziness of those traders that could inform me. There is no scholar and hardly a man of sense among them all."⁴

³ No attempt has been made to compare the information of the missionary of this period with the scientific knowledge of Indian life and customs as now known, or with other sources, contemporary or later.

⁴ Francis Le Jau to John Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, July 14, 1711, in Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts Manuscripts (Library of Congress Transcripts), A6, No. 104. Cited hereafter as S. P. G. MSS. For a survey of Le Jau's work in South Carolina, see Edgar L. Pennington, "The Reverend Francis Le Jau's Work among Indians and Negro Slaves," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 442-58.

Dr. Le Jau, soon after his arrival in South Carolina, became interested in communication with and in the instruction of the Indians. In December, 1706, he wrote to the Society:

They [the Indians] speak divers languages in their several nations, but I am . . . informed . . . that there is a language called the Savannas which is fine, smooth, and easy to be got . . . there is an Indian town an 100 miles of S. Carolina . . . where . . . that language may be learned. I propose that some young men not yet in holy orders, though with a tincture of good learning, should be encouraged to come upon that account and humbly submit my judgement to that of the Society.⁵

In September, 1708, the missionary sent a copy of the Lord's Prayer in the Savannah language to the S. P. G.⁶ The two Indian languages in most general use were the Yamassee and the Savonock, but these were unrelated languages. Each nation had not only a peculiar dialect but also a different language, "and yet the two languages of the north and south called Crick and Saoöck are understood by the respective inhabitants the most part and most sensible of them."⁷

The early letters report conversations with the Indians and especially note fragmentary references to biblical stories and teachings. Referring to the Indian conception of immortality, the Rev. Francis Varnod declared that all of the tribes had some notion of a life after death; they believed that "the wicked go in a cold country being very lean and naked . . . and that the good go in a very warm country where nothing is wanting to make them happy."⁸ The Rev. Robert Maule of St. John's had

⁵ Le Jau to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, December 2, 1706, in S. P. G. MSS., A3, No. 68. Le Jau secured this information from a certain Pike, an Indian trader. He called Savannas "The transcendent language of America."

⁶ *Id.* to [Secretary], St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, September 15, 1708, *ibid.*, A4, No. 125. Le Jau stated in a letter of February [19], 1710, that the language should be called Saonoh, "from the chief town inhabited by a colony that transplanted themselves from Albany to the place where the *Westos* lived Northwest of us." *Ibid.*, A5, No. 82.

⁷ Le Jau to Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 9, 1711, *ibid.*, A6, No. 58.

⁸ Francis Varnod to the Society, South Carolina, April 1, 1724, *ibid.*, B4, No. 173. An Indian burial ceremony is also described in this letter. See Herbert E. Bolton, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish-American Colonies," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXIII (1917), 42-61, for Roman Catholic work carried on across the continent from Florida to California. It is a reasonable assumption that Christian ideas could have permeated northward much beyond the immediate Spanish Florida frontier. Over one thousand Apalachi were sold into slavery in Carolina after a Spanish Franciscan

discovered in some of his conversation with the Indians, "their belief of a God and of future rewards and punishments. When I have asked, who it was that made them, and who it is who still provides for them they have pointed upwards with their finger and told me it was God."⁹

Dr. Le Jau was also convinced that the Indians had absorbed Christian ideas, through his observations of the Indians living near Goose Creek.¹⁰ Every year they had a dance which lasted for three days, during which time the men danced by themselves in the daylight hours; the women for that period never came near the men, but at night the women would dance by themselves. Le Jau asked the reason of that separation, and one of the men answered: "'twas to remember a time wherein Man was made alone and there was no woman; but, after God took somewhat out of man and made woman. Asking what it was God took, the man put his hand upon his breast . . . and then called it a bone. My wife presently named a rib, the Indian smiled and said Yes."¹¹

Another tribe, the Ittiwan, had a practice of taking annually the largest deer they could capture in a hunt on a particular day and of hanging it upon a long post to the Lord for Him to consume. Another Ittiwan custom was the annointment of a dead man with either bear or hickory oil by the women.¹² One Ittiwan Indian festival was carefully described by Dr. Le Jau in 1711. About forty Indians, painted and dressed in their finery and led by three young men, gave a ceremonial dance. Le Jau questioned an elderly Indian, a Captain George, about this ceremony, who replied that the three young men and those that followed were the sons of one man from whom the rest came, and the little hut where they stopped was a ship. Dr. Le Jau reflected:

This made me suspect they had some tradition about Noah's Ark and his three sons. I asked another Indian at my house about the ceremony, who told me of a ship that had white men which were brought to his country, and as he wanted mission established in northwest Florida between 1702 and 1708 was burnt and the priests killed, following a defeat at the hands of the English.

⁹ Robert Maule to Chamberlayne, [St. John's], South Carolina, August 2, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A7, pp. 363-64.

¹⁰ These were probably of the Yamassee tribe, although no tribe is mentioned.

¹¹ Le Jau to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 1, 1709/1710, in S. P. G. MSS., A5, No. 98.

¹² *Id.* to *id.*, *ibid.*

words to express his meaning I told him the best I could of the Ark of Noah. . . . He answered, "They said so in his country."¹⁸

The reports agree in the description of the Indian character as just and equitable in business dealings. Pride in his word did not permit an Indian chief to cheat or to bear being cheated. The heads of the families had great respect paid to them by their children, who were usually numerous. According to Varnod, who described their tribal practices in the words of the church, they permitted fornication but condemned adultery, for which some tribes punished their guilty women by cutting off their hair as a mark of infamy. Some tribes practiced circumcision. Variety of customs and differences in degrees of intelligence were impressed upon Le Jau who believed that the

Savannah Indians are but dull and mean to what the Florida Indians are whom we call amongst us Crick Indians. These last are honest, polite, and have noble and virtuous principles. The Crick Indians language is understood by many nations namely the Yamoussee, and I am still confirmed that the Savanock language is understood as far as Canada.¹⁴

The missionaries, as well as other residents of South Carolina, felt alarm over the French settlements on the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico. In 1708 the Rev. Robert Stevens advised the Secretary of the Society that it would be good policy for the Queen, in the impending treaty of peace, to oblige the French to leave their settlements "on all the Rivers, Bays, Harbours and Inlets on the Bay of Mexico," or else the French would draw the Indians to them by presents and force "so there will be no need of sending Missionaries to convert them."¹⁵

The greatest obstacle, however, in the way of Christianization was the conduct of the whites. In 1708 Commissary Gideon Johnston wrote to the Society:

The people here, generally speaking, are the vilest race of men upon the Earth, they have neither honour, nor honesty, nor Religion enough to entitle them to any tolerable character, being a perfect Medl[e]y or Hotch potch made up of Bankrupts, Pirates, decayed Libertines, Sectaries, and Enthusiasts of all sorts

¹⁸ *Id.* to [*id.*], St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, January 4, 1711/1712, *ibid.*, A7, p. 393.

¹⁴ *Id.* to *id.*, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 9, 1711, *ibid.*, A6, No. 58.

¹⁵ Robert Stevens to *id.*, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 3, 1708, *ibid.*, A4, No. 19.

who have transported themselves hither from the Bermudas, Jamaica, Barbadoes, Montserat, Antego, Nevis, New England, Pennsylvania, etc., and are the most factious and seditious people in the whole world.¹⁶

From the testimony of the Indian traders, Johnston formed the opinion that it was no hard matter to convert the Indians, but he knew "nothing that would obstruct it more; than the scandalous lives of those very traders who are a wretched sort of men."¹⁷

Indeed, beginning with the age of discovery, the missionary, together with the man of humanitarian instincts, has spoken of the white man's ruthlessness and evil effects upon the native in terms not different from those used by Commissary Johnston. Las Casas in the West Indies, Camoens in India, the Jesuits in Paraguay, and British missionaries in Africa have attempted to protect the native from absorption of the low points of European culture. In Paraguay an attempt was made, as is well known, to shut out the white man entirely, but, in the long run, his evil influences seeped in as did diseases of the body.¹⁸ Stevens held the opinion that the English, by their conduct on the frontier, shocked the Indians so that it was difficult to persuade them to embrace Christianity.¹⁹ Several of the Indian chiefs called at Stevens' home on their way to the Governor to complain that twenty families of them who had submitted to the English government were enslaved by two Indian traders. A distinguished American scholar has expressed the opinion in oral discussion that the North American Indian could not have been saved and that all the stupendous efforts made by missionaries, humanitarians, and governmental officials availed nothing. The impact of the whites, in their wide-fronted folk migration, swept the Indian westward and disintegrated his civilization. The inadequate internal cohesion of the Indian tribe and something in the nobility of his nature made it easy for the white man to bore within for commercial purposes with destructive results.

Dr. Le Jau, while admitting that the Indian's psychology and methods

¹⁶ Gideon Johnston to *id.*, September 20, 1708, *ibid.*, No. 97.

¹⁷ *Id.* to *id.*, Charlestown, South Carolina, July 5, 1710, *ibid.*, A5, No. 158.

¹⁸ For a short account of the Jesuits in Paraguay, see E. J. Payne, *History of European Colonies* (London, 1889), 94-97.

¹⁹ Stevens to Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 3, 1708, in S. P. G. MSS., A4, No. 19.

of warfare made him peculiarly self-destructive in his civil wars, lamented, "Is it not to be feared some white men living or trading among them do foment and increase that Bloody Inclination in order to get Slaves?"²⁰ In 1709 the missionary decided that,

if anything opposes the publishing of the Gospel among the Indians it shall be the manner how our Indian trade is carried on, chiefly the fomenting of war among them for our people to get slaves. . . . interest has a great power here and does occasion injustice too visibly to my great sorrow, and through misfortune I see no remedy but to be patient and pray and labour as much as I am able. . . .²¹

Daily complaints were received by Le Jau of the cruelty and injustice of the Indian traders. He related how, in 1710, a trader caused one of his female Indian slaves to be scalped within two miles of his house, and he wished it could be to the credit of the Society to prevent such enormities.²² Maule was creditably informed of the lewd and debauched practices of the traders, some of whom were "guilty of such gross enormities, as even the more modest heathens themselves have been ashamed of."²³ When Maule would ask the Indians if they desired to join the white man's religion, they usually said no. "'What is the matter,' said I, 'why so?' 'Because,' replied they, 'Backarara [whites] drunk grandy; me no lovy that.' "²⁴

In regard to the trader, David Livingstone felt that commerce could be a civilizing force and so stated before commercial gatherings on his various trips to England. He believed that, if the representative groups of a whole business community could be moved in, the evils of the pioneering fringe could be avoided. Various experiments made to keep the trader out entirely had merely resulted in keeping the desirable trader out. The native also, as sometimes happened, in a period of reversion to

²⁰ Le Jau to Secretary, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, April 22, 1708, *ibid.*, No. 64.

²¹ *Id.* to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, October 20, 1709, *ibid.*, A5, No. 49.

²² *Id.* to *id.*, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, June 13, 1710, *ibid.*, No. 120.

²³ Maule to *id.*, n. d. [1710], *ibid.*, No. 133. Maule stated in this letter that his work had been mostly with the whites, because he believed that if they could be persuaded to lead Christian lives, it would facilitate the conversion of both Negroes and Indians.

²⁴ *Id.* to *id.*, [St. John's], South Carolina, August 2, 1711, *ibid.*, A7, p. 365.

his older customs proved himself unmanageable by the relatively lone missionary.

The first missionary to South Carolina, the Rev. Samuel Thomas, was sent for the express purpose of converting the Yamassee Indians, but on arriving at Goose Creek he decided that the Negroes were in great need of Christianity, so he asked the Society to excuse "his going among the Indians and praying the Society to continue him in the place where he is now."²⁵ Again and again, the missionary of the S. P. G. was distracted by the richness of three fields: the semicivilized white inhabitants, the Negroes, who formed part of the white man's parish, and the Indians, who were on the move, interspersed by a few traders, and equally his charges. Whichever field he chose, heroic qualities were called for. Hostile planters watched his work among the slaves, and the Indian work had greater dangers of its own.

Thomas Nairne, agent for the Indians, was greatly perturbed over this action of Thomas. Nairne had written several letters to the S. P. G. discussing the arguments in favor of conversion of the Indians of South Carolina.²⁶ He said that Englishmen for the two past years had been "entirely kniving all the Indian towns in Florida which were subject to the Spaniards." By this means 1,600 Indians, mostly of the Yamassee tribe, had been brought to the colony. These Indians maintained their fidelity and friendship to the Spaniards and their friends until down-right force brought them to the English side. If the English did not take care of their salvation equal to that of the Spaniards, it would be like bringing people from Christianity to barbarity and heathenism.

Everybody knows we have the greatest quantity of Indians subject to this government of any in all America . . . with whom here hath never been any wrangle . . . from the first settlement of this province until this time who are so

²⁵ Rev. Mr. Samuel Thomas to [Secretary], South Carolina, January 29, 1702, in *Journal of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (Library of Congress Transcripts), I, June 18, 1703. Cited hereafter as *Journal S. P. G. Stevens of Goose Creek* said in 1705 that Thomas preached to a congregation already supplied with a minister, a Rev. Kendal. Thomas drew the congregation away from Kendal, who was left without a means of livelihood. See Stevens to the Society, n. d. [November, 1705?], *Goose Creek, South Carolina*, in *S. P. G. MSS.*, A2, No. 156.

²⁶ Thomas Nairne to Rev. Edward Marston, St. Helena, South Carolina, August 20, 1705, inclosed in a letter of Stevens to the Society, *Goose Creek, South Carolina*, n. d. [November, 1705?], *ibid.*, No. 156.

very subject to the government that they are ready to obey any fellow who trades among them. All this makes it easier for us to undertake propagating the Christian faith among them, than it is for the northern colonies. Besides that, their language is enriched with abundance of Spanish words particularly those pertaining to religion, the want of which often troubles missionaries.²⁷

Besides the spiritual benefits, Nairne stated it would conduce to the Indians' ease and satisfaction to have a good man live among them, apart from all the disputes of trade, who would, in fact, be a protector. He believed that it would be in vain for the Society to attempt any work without the concurrence of the government, and recommended that it have letters prepared from the Lords Proprietors and from one of the secretaries of state, in the Queen's name, to the Governor and Council of South Carolina. The letters should threaten the South Carolina government with royal displeasure if it failed to support the missionaries.

To meet the financial problems Nairne worked out an elaborate scheme for the maintenance of missionaries without any support from the Society. He proposed that the Queen settle £100 per annum out of her dues in the province; that the Lords Proprietors pay £80 per annum; and that an act be passed that every man who had traded with the Indians for three years should pay £4 yearly, and everyone else fifty shillings per annum during the initial three years, and then £4 for ever after. There were some fifty traders in South Carolina who would contribute at least £150 revenue,²⁸ and this added to the other would allow £330 for six missionaries, or £55 per annum for each one. He was convinced that Everyone will presently agree that it is reasonable the Indian traders should help towards converting and civilizing a people among whom they have got good estates, and to whom they have hitherto shown none of the best examples. These sparks make little of drinking 15 or 16 pounds in one bout in town, and they may spare so much from the punch keepers for this end, and they are no poorer at the years end.

Sir, this is the most easy method . . . and if the Society will . . . use their interest . . . they may doubtless bring their friends to bear.²⁹

²⁷ *Ibid.* See, also, Bolton, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish-American Colonies," in *loc. cit.*, 42-61.

²⁸ It appears that the amount to be paid yearly should be £3 instead of £4, as Nairne stated that the fifty men engaged in trading by paying £3 per year would raise £150, whereas if they paid the £4 as Nairne first stated the amount would be £200.

²⁹ Nairne to Marston, St. Helena, South Carolina, August 20, 1705, inclosed in a letter of

The missionaries sent by the Society, Nairne advised, should not be a nice, delicate sort of people, "but ones willing to bear hardships and live among uncivilized people, who had nothing of the fineness of the English people." Oftentimes, the town where the missionary would be stationed would have only two or three other white men. The S. P. G. was cautioned by Nairne to give the missionaries ample salaries, because the workers "must first apply themselves to learn their language and come with a pure design of increasing the Christian Church without any extraordinary hopes of riches or profit."³⁰

The ideas and plans of Thomas Nairne are particularly interesting when compared with the contemporaneous and later efforts made by the S. P. G. to Christianize the Iroquois. Nairne anticipated some of the plans of Sir William Johnson expressed in language curiously similar. Nairne viewed the Spanish Franciscan missionary from Florida in much the same way that Johnson viewed Jesuit penetration from Canada. Each Indian agent pointed out that the Roman Catholic missionaries mobilized and lived among the Indians to such good effect that comparable plans for Indian conversion and education might be developed by the Anglicans.³¹

The first opinion that Dr. Le Jau formed of the Indians, when he arrived in Goose Creek in 1706, was that they were "very quiet, sweet humored, and patient, content with little which are great dispositions to be true Christians."³² However, after he had lived in Goose Creek for six months, his good opinion grew even more favorable. The Indians with whom he had conversed made him "ashamed by their life, conversation, and sense of religion."³³ He found in the Indian as did other

Stevens to the Society, P. G., Goose Creek, South Carolina, n. d. [November, 1705?], in S. P. G. MSS., A2, No. 156.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ Frank J. Klingberg, "Sir William Johnson and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (1749-1774)," in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (Garrison, N. Y., 1932-), VIII (1939), 4-37; *id.*, "The Noble Savage as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary in Colonial New York, 1702-1750," *ibid.*, 128-65.

³² Le Jau to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, December 2, 1706, *ibid.*, A3, No. 68.

³³ *Id.* to Rev. Philip Stubbs, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, April 15, 1707, *ibid.*, A3, No. 141.

missionaries "nature's simple man," and he contributed in his own way to the development of "the cult of the noble savage." Whereas the Englishman's religion consisted chiefly of words and appearances, the Indians found theirs in reality; Dr. Le Jau expressed the hope that the savages would soon be worshipping Christ. The Indians had been oppressed, he said, by the traders, which made them surly. In 1708 he wrote to the Society:

The Yamassee's have sent for a Clergyman to baptise their children. I would willingly go and do which I could among them, if I had strength of Body sufficient; God willing . . . I will [have] . . . the Servants Slaves and free Indians to come and be Catechised. I perceive I shall be contradicted but I will try, and send you an account of all.³⁴

In April of the same year, 1708, the King of one of the Apalachi settlements honored Dr. Le Jau with a visit. Le Jau reported that he was a man of great power over his people and desired to have a minister reside among his tribe, most of whom had been baptized by their former rulers, the Spaniards.³⁵

By the next year, Dr. Le Jau reported the welcome news that he had several Indian slaves under trial for baptism, but he received no encouragement from masters or parents. He said, "I cannot to this day prevail upon some to make a difference between Slaves and free Indians, and Beasts."³⁶

Le Jau had formed the usual opinion that the free Indians were "a good sort of people" who would have been more civilized, if they had not been spoiled by bad examples. The Rev. Maule of St. John's was of the same opinion. The only plan for the conversion of the Indians that he could conceive of was to eliminate all the traders who did not lead a sober and virtuous life. "This I conceive would be an excellent means to hasten the conversion of these poor infidels, to make them in love with our religion and dispose them readily and heartily to embrace it."³⁷

³⁴ *Id.* to Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, March 13, 1708, *ibid.*, A4, No. 18.

³⁵ *Id.* to Secretary, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, April 22, 1708, *ibid.*, No. 64.

³⁶ *Id.* to Chamberlayne, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 18, 1709, *ibid.*, No. 142; also in Journal S. P. G., I, October 21, 1709.

³⁷ Maule to *id.*, n. d. [1710], in S. P. G. MSS., A5, No. 133; also in Journal S. P. G., I, October 20, 1710.

The sense of justice among the Indians, moreover, was admirable but "As for their sense of God, their notion[s] are obscure indeed, but when we take pains to converse with them in a jargon . . . We perceive their souls are fit materials which may easily be polished. They agree with me about the duty of praying and doing the good and eschewing the evil."³⁸ Many of the Indians could not conceive of murder as evil. Dr. Le Jau quaintly stated that some of the Indians confided in him by saying "that evil spirit never excites them to anything more than hatred, revenge, and murder of those that offend them."³⁹

The Indians around Goose Creek would go to see Dr. Le Jau whenever they happened to be living nearby,⁴⁰ but conversation was made difficult by lack of a common language, so he was constantly asking the Society to send a few young men among the Indians to learn the Savannah language, a tongue understood by all the Indian tribes. However, he noticed that the young Indians, born since the coming of the English, were tractable and spoke English quite clearly, even though their parents brought them up in wild fashion. The fathers and mothers declared they had forgotten most of their traditions since the establishment of the colony; they kept their festivals but could not give the reasons for them.⁴¹ Furthermore, some of the Apalachi Indian slaves were uncertain that they should be baptized in their state of comparative ignorance of Christianity, and, therefore, Dr. Le Jau asked if he could "baptize them conditionally."⁴²

All of the missionaries in the colony were handicapped by the scarcity of information concerning the Indians. The Yamassee were inclined to embrace the Christian faith, Commissary Johnston heard as early as 1711, and he wrote to John Chamberlayne that now that he had been

³⁸ Le Jau to *id.*, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, October 20, 1709, in S. P. G. MSS., A5, No. 49.

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ The Indians, of course, were constantly changing places in order to get food, having no provisions laid up.

⁴¹ Most of the old men had died or had gone farther up into the country because of bad treatment by the people and injustice of the traders.

⁴² Le Jau to [Secretary], South Carolina, February 10, 1709/1710, in Journal S. P. G., I, April 21, 1710; see, also, *ibid.*, II, May 18, 1711.

appointed a commissioner of the Indian Trade Act, he expected to obtain firsthand information concerning the spread of religion among all the Indians.⁴³ He also felt it his duty to give several Spanish New Testaments to the Spanish prisoners, held in Charleston. The Spaniards had no doubt but that the copies would be burned if they fell into Roman Catholic hands, and "that it would be a difficult matter for them to escape the same fate."⁴⁴ Commissary Johnston commented:

Upon my delivering the books to them, I asked them, by an interpreter, what they thought of the doctrine of transubstantiation, to which they readily answered that they believed as the Protestants did and presently turned over to I Cor. II where they said that article was set in the clearest light. . . . I was greatly pleased. . . .⁴⁵

In order to hasten the conversion of the Indians, fifty copies of the Spanish Testament were also sent to Dr. Le Jau to be dispersed among the Spaniards and Indians bordering on Carolina.⁴⁶ An indefatigable worker for the Society, in his spare hours he wrote his memoirs and a summary of the conversations he had concerning the Indians. The latter was based upon the information given to him by the more intelligent and honest traders.⁴⁷ This account of the Indians, chiefly of the Yamassee, he forwarded to the Society by Mrs. Gideon Johnston, in July, 1711.⁴⁸

Dr. Le Jau's good opinions of the Yamassee grew rapidly: if two young single men having a disposition to learn the Creek language which is understood all over the southern parts of this settlement would trust themselves into the hands of the Yamsasi . . . they would provide for them and entertain them with great respect and affection. Besides our own people live

⁴³ Johnston to Chamberlayne, [Charlestown, South Carolina], January 27, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A6, No. 64. Commissary Johnston said that poor health and insufficient funds were obstacles in the way of his gaining more information about the Indians.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* Johnston could not keep the Spaniards from kissing his hands as a gesture of thankfulness for the books.

⁴⁶ Journal S. P. G., I, June 16, 1710; II, May 18, 1711. Le Jau was also asked if it would be advantageous to give Spanish Testaments to the Spaniards and Indians of Florida or the West Indies.

⁴⁷ Le Jau to Chamberlayne, Goose Creek, South Carolina, February 9, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A6, No. 58; also in Journal S. P. G., II, May 18, 1711.

⁴⁸ *Id.* to *id.*, Goose Creek, South Carolina, July 10, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A6, No. 103.

within 20 or 15 miles of those Nations, who really by my own observation are a rational and generous people above the rest of our neighboring Indians.⁴⁹

A remnant of the Apalachi tribe, moreover, was also desirous of having missionaries reside among them, according to Dr. Le Jau, but he was not informed as to what they could do for a clergyman if one were sent. When this information reached the Lord Bishop of London he wrote to the Secretary of the S. P. G., William Taylor, in January, 1713, requesting him to send two missionaries to the Yamassee and the Apalachi, who would receive them well. And the Lord Bishop added that he had received his information from Dr. Le Jau "whom the Society very well knows, and is acquainted with his Sincerity, and good understanding."⁵⁰

By 1713 forewarnings of the disastrous Indian War were appearing. Dr. Le Jau at this very time gave an account of the Yamassee, in which he said that the "brown" men could formerly muster eight hundred warriors, but now they were so reduced by wars that they could not raise four hundred. All the other Indian allies were in the same predicament. Indian intertribal wars would likely continue, because the fur trade was not flourishing, and the Indians would sell one another to the French or Spaniards to pay for the goods the traders sold them.⁵¹ Early in the eighteenth century the English settlements were penetrating away from the coast to the west and coming into contact with powerful tribes of which the Yamassee were most immediately on the line of march. A relatively small tribe, but extremely warlike, they were defeated in 1715 and largely dispersed, some returning to Florida to rejoin a remnant of the tribe still living there, and others were lost.

However, Dr. Le Jau never lost faith in the Indians, even though he reported that many of the clergy had been driven from their parishes⁵² by the Indian uprisings. He maintained that the Indians were "very

⁴⁹ *Id.* to [William Taylor], St. James Parish, Goose Creek, South Carolina, August 30, 1712, *ibid.*, A7, pp. 436-37.

⁵⁰ Lord Bishop of London to *id.*, Fulham, London, January 18, 1712/1713, *ibid.*, p. 43. The Lord Bishop described the Yamassee as a "brave, generous, and civilized people."

⁵¹ Le Jau to *id.*, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, August 10, 1713, *ibid.*, A8, p. 363; Journal S. P. G., II, June 1, 1714.

⁵² *Id.* to [Secretary], South Carolina, August 23, [1715], in Journal S. P. G., III, March 6, 1715/1716.

British People" and if some minister would live among them and learn their language, it would in time do good to the youth.⁵³ Before the Indian attack upon the colonists interrupted the good relations it may be said that from the beginning of the Society's work in South Carolina, very few Indian baptisms had been made. One of the first baptisms of an Indian slave was recorded by Rev. Thomas Hasell of St. Thomas Parish in 1711.⁵⁴ In 1714 Rev. William Taylor of St. Andrew's reported that he had lately baptized twenty-six persons, Negroes and Indians,⁵⁵ and had one Indian boy of his own whom he intended to baptize before long.⁵⁶

As stated above, the disastrous Indian War, which started on Good Friday, April 15, 1715, completely dispersed some Indian nations, and many of the white settlements were evacuated. It is interesting to note the causes of the war as explained by one of the Society's missionaries, the Rev. William Bull of Charleston.

We . . . acknowledge that our manifold sins and wickedness have justly drawn this judgment from him. . . .

The manner also of carrying on the trade among the Indians . . . the most profligate and debauched generally undertaking that business. . . .

Another occasion . . . of the war . . . [is] the poverty of the Indians and the wealth of the English. . . .

There's another reason. . . . They say that the Indians are so naturally addicted to war and bloodshed and so long accustomed to it that 'tis almost impossible for them to abstain from it.⁵⁷

The Rev. Bull declared that the government had endeavored to persuade the several Indian tribes to be at peace with one another. Therefore, the Indians were much strengthened by being at peace among themselves, and resolved to try to cut off all the whites. The design of the Christians to promote peace was very laudable, Bull was persuaded,

⁵³ *Id.* to [*id.*], St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, March 19, 1715/1716, *ibid.*, February 1, 1716/1717.

⁵⁴ Thomas Hassell to Chamberlayne, St. Thomas Parish, South Carolina, September 4, 1711, in S. P. G. MSS., A6, No. 143; Journal S. P. G., II, December 21, 1711.

⁵⁵ The exact number of Indians baptized is not given. Taylor to [Secretary], St. Andrews Parish, South Carolina, December 31, 1714, in Journal S. P. G., III, October 7, 1715.

⁵⁶ This boy was under six years of age, yet he could say most of the catechism distinctly.

⁵⁷ William Tredwell Bull to Taylor, Charlestown, South Carolina, August 10, 1715, in S. P. G. MSS., B4, No. 23.

and "had the advancement of God's glory rather than that of trade been the . . . inducement . . . the consequences . . . would not have been . . . so fatal."⁵⁸

Bull was forced from his parish as were many others. The Rev. Will Guy expressed the opinion that, even if peace came soon, it would be a long time before he could hope to see his parish repeopled, because the inhabitants would still remain suspicious of the fidelity of the Indians.⁵⁹ The missionary for St. Thomas, Rev. Hasell, wrote to the Society that he could give no account of the state of his parish because most of the men were under arms and everything generally disrupted.⁶⁰ St. Bartholomew's Parish was deserted, and the Rev. Nathaniel Osburn was forced to flee.⁶¹ Many of the parishes were without missionaries for eight years or more, among them St. Paul's, St. Bartholomew's, and St. Helen's.⁶²

However, Commissary Johnston was optimistic. He declared:

once the war is over . . . I do not despair, but as much may be done towards conversion of the neighboring Indians as could be hoped for before. And if I am not mistaken, the disposition of these infidels may be supposed to be in, after an unfortunate war, (in which they have been miserably defeated and disappointed) will render them more susceptible of advice, and more willing to hearken to anything which may hereafter be offered to them on this subject.⁶³

Unfortunately, in 1716 Commissary Johnston was drowned, and the following year Dr. Le Jau passed away; with the death of these two men the Indian cause lost its most ardent champions.

Francis Varnod, who was sent to South Carolina in 1723, wanted to carry out some of the ideas fostered by Dr. Le Jau. His first letter to the Society from the colony recommended the sending of a young man, in deacon's orders, to go with the traders and settle among the Indians.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ Will Guy to Taylor, Charlestown, South Carolina, September 20, 1715, *ibid.*, No. 25.

⁶⁰ Hasell to [Secretary], St. Thomas, South Carolina, May 26, 1715, in Journal S. P. G., III, October 7, 1715.

⁶¹ Rev. Mr. Nathaniel Osborn to [Secretary], South Carolina, May 27, 1715, *ibid.*

⁶² Memorial of the Rev. Mr. William Tredwell Bull to the Society, London, August 16, 1723, in S. P. G. MSS., A17, pp. 39-41. Each missionary was given a half year's salary as a gratuity for the hardships he underwent; also £30 was given to two French ministers, John Lapierre and Philip Richburg, who were in dire circumstances. See David Humphreys, *Historical Account of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (London, 1730), 101.

⁶³ Johnston to Taylor, Charlestown, South Carolina, December 19, 1715, in S. P. G. MSS., B4, No. 37.

The heathens had a very sedate and tranquil temper, Varnod stated, as compared to the hot and violent temper of the Negroes.

They are not . . . so destitute of religion as is commonly thought. They entertain a notion of a supreme being . . . they believe that there was . . . an universal flood. . . . Here is a form of prayer used by one of the Indian Kings. . . .

"Thou chief king of all things, let this day be a prosperous one to me, and favor me with the continuance of my being for I thank thee who regard-est me."

And as the Cherokee nation is the most populous, it is to be wished that attempts were made to plant Christianity there first.⁶⁴

The two vices that the Christian whites had taught the Indians, Varnod explained, were drinking and stealing, particularly the former.⁶⁵

Indeed, some of the parishes, after the war, had very few, if any, Indians. Christ Church Parish had no free Indians in 1716.⁶⁶ In 1720 Hasell had only about ninety Indian slaves; he reported in his "notitia parochialis" that "none of the uncivilized heathen inhabit constantly in any part of my parish that I know of."⁶⁷ Yet, sometimes he would meet a few Ittiwan, who, he learned, had an imperfect notion of two states after death, a good and a bad. By March, 1722, there was one family of free Indians in St. Thomas⁶⁸ and by October of the same year there were five.⁶⁹ Hasell continued to report a few free Indians in his parish, but, in 1724, he said they were "moving people, often changing their place of habitation, so that I can give no account of their numbers."⁷⁰

⁶⁴ Varnod to Humphreys, Dorchester, South Carolina, January 13, 1723, *ibid.*, No. 132. Varnod said the Cherokee were divided into ten tribes, their language was very guttural, and contained a few Hebrew or Phoenician words.

⁶⁵ *Id.* to the Society, South Carolina, April 1, 1724, *ibid.*, No. 173. The necessity for traders and missionaries to lead exemplary lives was discussed by Dr. Richard Reynolds, Bishop of Lincoln, in his *A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; At the Parish-Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, On Friday the 16th of February, 1727 . . .* (London, 1728). Copy in Huntington Library.

⁶⁶ Gilbert Jones to [Secretary], Christ Church Parish, South Carolina, November 6, 1716, in S. P. G. MSS., B4, No. 75.

⁶⁷ Hasell to Humphreys, Pumpkin Hill, St. Thomas Parish, South Carolina, February 16, 1720, *ibid.*, A14, p. 70.

⁶⁸ "Notitia parochialis" accompanying *id.* to *id.*, St. Thomas, South Carolina, March 20, 1721/1722, *ibid.*, B4, No. 103.

⁶⁹ "Notitia parochialis" accompanying *id.* to *id.*, St. Thomas, South Carolina, October 20, 1722, *ibid.*, No. 125.

⁷⁰ "Notitia parochialis" of Hasell, St. Thomas Parish, South Carolina, April 15, 1724, *ibid.*, 174.

In the same year Brian Hunt reported the number of inhabitants in his parish: 161 white men, 108 white women, 223 children, and 1,479 slaves. All the whites were baptized save a few infants, but "None of the slaves, Indians or negros are baptized save one."⁷¹ He also recorded about ten or twelve families of the Ittiwan Indians, who were straying about from place to place, and were living a wild life. These were a headstrong, idle, stupid people, who seemed incapable of understanding the Christian religion, and few could talk English intelligently; therefore, they continued heathens as all were throughout the province.⁷²

Illustrative of the exact information gathered and sent home in reports, is the letter of the Rev. Varnod, who had a census of the Creek Indians taken for him in 1725 by Captain Charlesworth Glover, and the returns showed 1,452 men, 1,560 women, 990 children, or 4,002 Indians altogether.⁷³ This same report gave the number of Savannah Indians as 30. The count of the Chickasaw, Captain Glover stated, could not be given accurately, because they were distributed among all the other nations. It was also observed that the Indians were declining everywhere except the "Youches" of the Creek tribe, because women frequently murdered their children on the least quarrel between them and their husbands.⁷⁴ Although Varnod transmitted this report to the Society, and took an interest in the Indians' conversion, he stated clearly, in 1727, that he had no thoughts of changing his parish "or going among the Indians, finding the last would be expensive and that to no purpose"⁷⁵ unless he were twelve or fifteen years younger.

In 1729 the Rev. Thomas Morritt of Winyaw reported that he had about "two or 300 Native Indians scattered about the settlements."⁷⁶ By

⁷¹ Brian Hunt to Humphreys, St. John's, South Carolina, May 25, 1724, *ibid.*, No. 179.

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ Captain [Charlesworth] Glover's account of Indian tribes, March 15, 1724/1725, enclosed in Varnod to Humphreys, March 21, 1724/1725, *ibid.*, A19, pp. 92-93. The three provinces noted in the account were: the O'Chaseys or lower province, the Taley Pooses or middle province, and the Abekeers or upper province.

⁷⁴ Glover estimated that the women destroyed one fourth of their children (except the Youches) either before or after birth. *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ Varnod to Humphreys, Dorchester, South Carolina, January 4, 1726/1727, *ibid.*, B4, No. 194.

⁷⁶ Thomas Morritt to *id.*, Winnyaw, South Carolina, September 1, 1729, *ibid.*, No. 234.

1730 there were three families of free Indians in Christ Church Parish, some of whom went to church.⁷⁷ In 1731 Varnod registered the baptism of a sambo Indian child in the Uchee Indian town.⁷⁸ Five children, baptized in 1736 by Rev. Thomas Thompson of St. Bartholomew's, had an Indian mother.⁷⁹ The Rev. John Fordyce of Frederic's Parish in 1737 said he had about 1,100 heathens and infidels but few Indians.⁸⁰ In 1740 Thompson reported that he had baptized one free Indian woman, who had earnestly requested it.⁸¹ Rev. Timothy Millechamp, missionary to St. James, Goose Creek, complained in 1741 of the difficulty of making out his "notitia parochialis" because the mountains, inhabited by the Cherokee, were supposed to be in his parish, and he had no way of finding out the number of Indians but he thought there were about 10,000. In his immediate vicinity there were twenty unbaptized Indians.⁸² The Rev. Stephen Roe of St. George's said he had about 3,200 heathens and infidels but no wandering Indians.⁸³ But the Rev. William Orr of St. Paul's Parish had a tribe of 65 Indians called Cussoes. They were sober men and had a notion of a Deity that made them, but did not appear at all concerned to serve him. He intended to use his best efforts to teach them and bring them to a true knowledge of God.⁸⁴

⁷⁷ John Fulton to *id.*, Christ Church, South Carolina, December 4, 1730, *ibid.*, A23, p. 222.

⁷⁸ Varnod to *id.*, Dorchester, St. George's, South Carolina, August 9, 1731, *ibid.*, B4, No. 249.

⁷⁹ Thomas Thompson to *id.*, St. Bartholomew's, South Carolina, May 1, 1736, *ibid.*, No. 266; also in Journal S. P. G., VII, September 17, 1736. These baptisms were made in upper Savannah Town at the garrison kept for the safety of the Indian traders.

⁸⁰ Rev. John Fordyce to [Secretary], Frederic's Parish, South Carolina, July 25, 1737, in Journal S. P. G., VII, August 18, 1738.

⁸¹ Thompson to *[id.]*, St. Bartholomew's, South Carolina, October 14, 1740, *ibid.*, VIII, January 16, 1740/1741.

⁸² Timothy Millechamp to *[id.]*, St. James, Goose Creek, South Carolina, October 15, 1741, *ibid.*, IX, February 19, 1741/1742.

⁸³ Stephen Roe to [Philip Bearcroft], St. George's Parish, South Carolina, December 28, 1741, in S. P. G. MSS., B10, No. 174.

⁸⁴ William Orr to [Secretary], St. Paul's Parish, South Carolina, March 30, 1743, in Journal S. P. G., LX, November 18, 1743. The Society in London, however, held the belief that the Indians were capable of instruction and Christianization. See Dr. Richard Osbaldestone, Bishop of Carlisle, *A Sermon Preached before the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; at their Anniversary Meeting in the Parish Church of St. Mary-le-Bow, On Friday February 21, 1752* (London, 1752). Copy in Huntington Library.

But this attempt, as well as all the other plans, was never converted into a reality. From 1704 to 1715 the missionaries had been formulating ideas for conversion, and, as already indicated, just when it seemed that either the pleas of Dr. Le Jau or Commissary Johnston had not been heard in vain, the Indian War broke out and so completely dispersed the Indians and impoverished the missionaries that new plans had to be started. A few Indians were brought over to the Christian side from 1715 to 1765, as has been stated, but the majority of them were still heathens when the first rumblings of the American Revolution were heard. The whites, by this time, had not yet been able to understand the Indian. The colonists had always been fearful of an Indian attack ever since the war in 1715. In 1725 the Rev. Richard Ludham of Goose Creek had explained, "As matters stand with us we make use of a wile for our present security to make the Indians and negroes a check upon each other lest by their vastly superior numbers we should be crushed by one or the other."⁸⁵ Evidently this scheme worked well for some time, because in 1759 the Rev. Alexander Garden wrote to David Humphreys that the province of South Carolina had so far enjoyed a profound peace.⁸⁶ Yet he reported,

we are now likely to be engaged in a dangerous Indian war with the Cherokee Nation. One half of the Inhabitants from the Age 16 to 60 years are drawn but to march at an hours warning, and our Governor is set out with a Body of Men for that Country. . . . So that I am affraid Religion will make but little Progress amidst these Confusions.⁸⁷

Between 1760 and 1763 the missionaries were reporting the attacks of the Cherokee, and the flight of many parishioners. Furthermore, in 1759 the Society had decided not to fill up the missions as they were vacated because "the Colonists were . . . building and endowing Churches and Schools."⁸⁸ For some years the Indians, withdrawing, had been twenty

⁸⁵ Richard Ludlam to Humphreys, Goose Creek, South Carolina [ca. March], 1725, in S. P. G. MSS., A19, pp. 66-67.

⁸⁶ Alexander Garden to *id.*, Charlestown, South Carolina, October 31, 1759, *ibid.*, B4, No. 284; also in Journal S. P. G., XIV, April 18, 1760.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ C. F. Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, 2 vols. (London, 1901), I, 18. The last vacancy, Pascoe states, was in 1766,

miles distant, then fifty, then three hundred miles away from the center of the white man's parish and settlement. The search for the adventurous type of missionary, willing to live at higher altitudes, to migrate with the Indian to learn his language and to bear the hardships and dangers of his isolation, became more difficult as the Indian increased his distance from the border regions.⁸⁹

In South Carolina, as in many other places, the missionary represented imperial as well as Protestant missionary zeal. He therefore regarded the Roman Catholic missionary to the south of him in Spanish lands and the French missionary in the Mississippi Valley with double hostility, as encroaching upon British territories on behalf of their own governments, and as spreading non-Anglican teachings. Unfortunately, the Indian was in the position of a migratory buffer state, with the long-armed tentacles of rival fur and other traders from the three powers pulling the tribes apart either by actual kidnapping or by means of internal fratricidal conflict. Troubles never came singly, and Indian uprisings, wars, and rumors of war, the decimation and flight of the Indians were followed almost immediately by the death of two men of outstanding ability and imagination—Commissary Johnston and Dr. Le Jau, of whose total work only a fragment is here presented. No one rose to take their places, hence the unequal fight for Indian Christianization for the next fifty years fell into faithful but less skilled hands, as the ever restless white man moved relentlessly westward.⁹⁰

During the formative period of the Society's work, when its plans, organization, and mature strength were still in the future, reports from its wide front were reaching London from all over the colonies. South Carolina was a strategic sphere of experiment and achievement; its treble frontier against the Indian, Frenchman, and the Spaniard, the close connection with the West Indies and with the Northern colonies

but in 1770 Rev. Mr. S. F. Lucius was sent to Coffee Town at the request of the inhabitants to be the Society's missionary until the close of the Revolution.

⁸⁹ For a thoughtful analysis of the missionary's function, see the statements made by Lodwick C. Hartley, in his penetrating *William Cowper, Humanitarian* (Chapel Hill, 1938), 97-111.

⁹⁰ A separate study of Dr. Le Jau's work among the Negroes will provide additional material for analysis and appraisal.

through the great port of the South, brought many-sided interests into focus. Charleston was the port of entry for both the Carolinas and for Georgia and occupied the position which New York later was to have for a wide area.

British traders in this wide area made contacts with the Indian tribes as far west as the Mississippi River, establishing a superiority over both Spanish and French traders. The force of this rivalry in trade and influence was destructive of Indian tribal life, and of Spanish missionary enterprise, success of which is reflected in the reports of the S. P. G. missionary. On the British side, in this struggle for continental boundaries, the trader occupied first place and eventually was able to bring imperial support to his side. The missionary, not wanted by the trader on the frontier, was, nevertheless, though outdistanced, a reporter of the white man's impact on the Indian. On the other side of these buffer regions, the Spanish and French priest and soldier, often first on the scene, were to be overwhelmed by British colonial and imperial forces. However, zones of former Latin occupancy, whether Spanish or French, could not be wholly obliterated.⁹¹

⁹¹ For a comparative study of this double frontier, see the Introduction, entitled "The Debatable Land, A Sketch of the Anglo-Spanish Contest for the Georgia Country," in Herbert E. Bolton, *Arredondo's Historical Proof of Spain's Title to Georgia* (Berkeley, 1925), 1-110. See, also, Verner W. Crane, "The Southern Frontier in Queen Anne's War," in *American Historical Review*, XXIV (1919), 379-95. For a definitive analysis of pioneer conditions in South Carolina and of colonial relations with the Indians, the Spaniards, and the French, see Verner W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Durham, 1928). Professor Crane availed himself of the pertinent materials in the archives and libraries of Great Britain and the United States, including the records of the English missionary societies. A comprehensive bibliography and an excellent map are provided.

Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist

By WILLIAM DIAMOND

One of the products of the boisterous nationalism and optimism of the late twenties, thirties, and forties in the United States was the development of what has come to be known as the American nationalist school of political economy. Stemming directly from Alexander Hamilton and the Federalist tradition, this school—through Mathew Carey, Daniel Raymond, John Rae, Hezekiah Niles, to Henry C. Carey—was struck by the great material differences between Europe and America. In contrast to Europe's density of population, superfluity of labor, and insufficiency of land, these men found America sparsely settled and lacking sufficient population to make an impression on its tremendous frontiers. In America they witnessed a diversity of economic phenomena and a freedom from limitation unparalleled in Europe. In short, planted in an environment totally different from that of Europe, in an environment of unheard-of wealth, these men believed themselves faced with the necessity of rejecting the classical political economy of Adam Smith, Malthus, and Ricardo, and of espousing the idea that all economic principles are relative to time and place, that political economy is an art and not a science. As Raymond succinctly put it, he wished to "break loose from the fetters of foreign authority—from foreign theories and systems of political economy, which from the dissimilarity in the nature of the governments, renders them altogether unsuited to our country."¹

These men broke from the Smithian tradition and adopted a theory of economic development requiring a large degree of national control. The nationalist school was, in a sense, neomercantilist. It was concerned pri-

¹ Daniel Raymond, *Thoughts on Political Economy* (Baltimore, 1820), v-vi.

marily, not with the individual, but with the state as a national unit and with its prosperity and wealth. The heart of the nationalist doctrine lay in the concept of national productive capacity, and it rejected the idea that the wealth of a nation is equal to the sum of the wealth of its individuals. Its aim was the harmony of all interests within the nation under the supremacy of the Federal government. The main point in its program declared that the proper means to this desirable end was the congressional legislation of protective tariffs and internal improvements.²

The nationalists were generally Northerners by birth as well as in economic and political ideas. One of the least known figures in the nationalist school, however, is Nathaniel A. Ware, a Southerner "by birth and interest."³ Self-identified with the Southern states, a banker, planter,

² John R. Turner, *The Ricardian Theory in Early American Economics* (New York, 1921); T. E. C. Leslie, "Political Economy in the United States," in *Fortnightly Review* (London, 1865-), n.s., XXVIII (1880), 488-509; Kenneth W. Rowe, *Mathew Carey: A Study in American Economic Development*, in Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, LI, No. 4 (Baltimore, 1933); George G. Stone, *Hezekiah Niles as an Economist*, *ibid.*, No. 5 (Baltimore, 1933); A. D. H. Kaplan, *Henry C. Carey: A Study in American Economic Thought*, *ibid.*, XLIX, No. 4 (Baltimore, 1931).

³ There has so far been no adequate sketch of Ware's life. Biographical information must be gleaned from many sources, primary and secondary. There is a brief sketch by Broadus Mitchell in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XIX, 451; and in *Palgrave's Dictionary of Political Economy*, 3 vols. (London, 1923-1926), III, 805-806. These encyclopedias are the only two containing accounts which recognize and discuss Ware's associations with the nationalist school. There are also brief paragraphs in most of the encyclopedias of American biography, all of which are in substantial agreement and of little value. Information on Ware will be found in biographical sketches of his daughter, Catherine Ann Warfield, in *Library of Southern Literature*, 16 vols. (De Luxe ed., New Orleans, Atlanta, Dallas, 1909-1913), XII, 5617-19; Mary Forrest [Julia Deane Freeman], *Women of the South Distinguished in Literature* (New York, 1866); Ida Raymond [M. T. Tardy], *Southland Writers*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1870). Of some value, too, are Dunbar Rowland, *Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Mississippi, 1798-1935* (Jackson, 1935), which gives some information about Ware's appointments during his Mississippi days; and *The Official and Statistical Register of Mississippi, 1924-28* (Jackson, n.d.), which does the same. Of primary sources of information, the most valuable are two in number: Clarence E. Carter (ed.), *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, VI, *The Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817* (Washington, 1938). Cited hereafter as *Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817*. It contains letters to, by, and about Ware during his residence in Mississippi as a government official. The volume also contains valuable references to letters concerning Ware in the Appointment Office files of the State Department. The second source is the "Executive Journal of Governor Holmes, 1814-1817," MSS. now in the Territorial Papers Division of the State Department and soon to be deposited in The National Archives. Additional bibliography will be cited in other footnotes.

and slaveowner, he was nevertheless an ardent nationalist. A government official in early manhood, he acquired a fortune, became a gentleman of leisure in Philadelphia, and later a speculator and perhaps a manufacturer; he traveled widely, acquired an interest in science, especially in its application to intensive agriculture, and developed an enthusiasm for the "Harmony of Interests." He was clearly and definitely a neomercantilist. His economic doctrine, coinciding in so many ways with that of the nationalist school and of the Southern Whig slavocracy of which he was a member, differed occasionally from both. He was as much a belligerent Whig of the Clay National Republican faction as a national economist.

Little is known of the life of Nathaniel W. Ware, and that little is often questionable, largely fragmentary, and gives no adequate picture of the man. Ware was born in South Carolina, perhaps in Abbeville, either in 1780 or 1789.⁴ He taught school for a while and at the same time studied and perhaps even practiced law. Sometime before May, 1811, he removed to Mississippi Territory, probably to the town of Natchez. There he was commissioned an attorney at law.⁵ Ware was never, in all probability, an eminent lawyer; there is no evidence that he ever made an extensive professional use of his legal training after he left Mississippi in 1820 or 1821. When the War of 1812 began, he became active in support of the United States, joined the militia, and acquired the rank of major. It is probable that at this early period Ware was a Jeffersonian Republican.

⁴ The determination of the state in which Ware was born seems fairly certain. The biographical encyclopedias are divided between Abbeville, South Carolina, and Massachusetts, and 1780 and 1789. *Appleton's Cycloedia of American Biography*, for instance, in its 1889 edition (VI, 358), gives Massachusetts, 1789; and in its 1915 edition (VI, no paging), Abbeville, 1780. While the writer has not been willing to agree on a date for Ware's birth, he has decided upon South Carolina as its scene on the basis of three independent bits of evidence. Ware's *Notes on Political Economy* claims the author was a Southerner "by birth and interest." A letter from Josiah Simpson, dated March 28, 1815, recommending Ware for the secretaryship of Mississippi, states he was "a native of South Carolina" (see n. 7). A great-grandson of Ware has informed the writer that he "thinks" Ware was born in South Carolina. The evidence seems sufficient.

⁵ Register of Appointments, 1805-1812, p. 88. For partnership with Thomas B. Reed, see *Washington Republican*, August 18, 1813. Both cited in Rowland, *Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Mississippi*, 73-74.

Very early in his career in Mississippi, Ware became associated with the territorial government. From January, 1813, until Mississippi was admitted to the Union in 1817, he held office as member of the Legislative Council and of the House of Representatives, as secretary and as acting governor of the Territory.⁶ During this time he had both friends and enemies; by the former at least he was recognized as an able and respected man who could be expected to fill any office creditably. He was once recommended as a "gentleman of highly respectable legal acquirements, of a very capacious, vigorous, and enlightened mind, and of most inflexible integrity."⁷ Yet, in 1817 his efforts to secure election to Congress and to the Mississippi constitutional convention both resulted in failure.⁸ Meanwhile, he had amassed a considerable fortune as a result of land speculation.

In 1814 Ware married Mrs. Sarah Percy Ellis, daughter of a British naval officer and an early settler in Louisiana.⁹ To them was born in 1816 a daughter, Catherine Ann, who was later to make a reputation for herself as a Southern novelist and poet.¹⁰ With the birth of their second daughter, four years later, a new phase of Ware's life began. His wife,

⁶ The outlines of Ware's legislative and executive career may be pieced together from various items in the following sources: Carter (ed.), *Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817*, pp. 196, 302-303, 354, 384, 414, 417, 418, 447-48, 421-22, 526-27, 541, 553-56, 560, 691-92, 704, 719-20, 789, 794; *Official and Statistical Register of Mississippi, 1924-28*, pp. 17, 22; Ware to Thomas B. Robertson, February 26, 1815 (enclosed in Robertson to the Secretary of State, March 25, 1815); Calhoun to the President, April 2, 1815; Josiah Simpson to the Secretary of State, March 28, 1815 (all in the Appointment Office files of the State Department); "Executive Journal of Governor Holmes, 1814-1817."

⁷ Simpson to the Secretary of State, March 28, 1815 (Appointment Office files of the State Department). Twelve members of the Mississippi House of Representatives in a petition to the President, once objected to Ware's appointment to office on the grounds that his politics were not "strictly Republican" and that he "has no permanent residence in the Territory." Carter (ed.), *Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817*, pp. 421-22.

⁸ *Washington Republican*, January 22, May 21, 1817, cited in Rowland, *Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Mississippi*, 74; Dunbar Rowland, "Mississippi's First Convention," in Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications* (Oxford, etc., 1897-1914, Centenary Series, 1916-1925), VI (1902), 81-82.

⁹ Mitchell, "Nathaniel A. Ware," in *loc. cit.*, 451; *Washington Republican*, September 7, 1814, cited in Rowland, *Courts, Judges, and Lawyers of Mississippi*, 74; [Freeman], *Women of the South*, 114; [Tardy], *Southland Writers*, I, 26.

¹⁰ Grant C. Knight, "Catherine Ann Ware Warfield," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIX, 454.

suffering from puerperal fever, became insane, and the care and education of the two girls fell upon his shoulders.

From 1820 to his death thirty-four years later, it is impossible to trace Ware's movements with any degree of certainty. Apparently he sold his estates and went with his family to Philadelphia, partly in a vain attempt to cure his suffering wife, partly for the sake of the education of his daughters.¹¹ For at least a year, from the spring of 1822, Ware was a commissioner for the adjudication of land claims in Florida, and spent a large part of his time there.¹² He probably returned to Philadelphia immediately thereafter. Passionately devoted to his daughters, he made every effort to educate them properly. Believing that education by the book must be supplemented by travel, he devoted a portion of each year to wandering in both North and South. He was apparently a man of leisure at the time, and was never long separated from his daughters. He finally settled definitely in Philadelphia.¹³

Meanwhile, in October, 1823, Ware had been elected to membership in the American Philosophical Society, the intellectual focus of Philadelphia.¹⁴ In that city, and through the Society, Ware may have met men who exercised a profound influence on his thinking and oriented it in the direction later apparent in his writings on political economy—such men as DeWitt Clinton, the New York governor whose canal was a model for internal improvements, Mathew and Henry C. Carey, the well-known economists, Edward Everett, Nicholas Biddle, of the United States Bank, Isaac Lea, Franklin Bache, and others. The Society was a

¹¹ [Freeman], *Women of the South*, 114; [Tardy], *Southland Writers*, I, 27.

¹² A letter from Andrew Jackson to Dr. James C. Bronaugh, May 29, 1822, in John S. Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, 6 vols. (Washington, 1926-1933), III, 163, indicates that Ware held some such position. Letters from Ware and Samuel R. Overton, commissioners, to President Monroe, August 24, 1822, and to Secretary John Q. Adams, August 25, 1822, may be found in State Papers, Misc. Let. 88, July and August, 1822, and to Adams again, October 21, 1822, in Misc. Let. 89, September and October, 1822, MSS. in The National Archives. A fourth letter from Overton to Monroe, July 10, 1823, in Misc. Let. 95, July and August, 1823, indicates that Ware had just resigned. There is a letter from Ware to Overton, December 29, 1822, in the New York Public Library.

¹³ [Freeman], *Women of the South*, 114-15; [Tardy], *Southland Writers*, I, 27-29.

¹⁴ Elected October 17, 1823. *List of the Members of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia, 1838).

vast repository of information, and Ware probably made good use of it. At this time, too, Mathew Carey was at the height of his power and influence as a force in American economic life. It is highly probable that Ware knew him and was a member of his circle. A letter written by Ware during this Philadelphia period shows that he was already keenly interested in American manufacturing and was taking pains to acquire data not only for cotton, his main interest, but for wool and iron as well.¹⁵ Early in 1831 Ware made an effort to establish a cotton manufactory in Texas, but the plan never materialized—partly, at least, because of the failure of a New Orleans company to which he had loaned money.¹⁶

After a brief interval in Cincinnati and a year in France, he next appeared as a wealthy landowner and prominent banker of Natchez. In New York on July 5, 1839, Ware, "whose name carried weight," was the first of fourteen prominent Southern bankers and planters to sign a circular "To the Cotton Planters, Merchants, Factors, and Presidents and Directors of the several Banks of the Southern States" calling a convention to deliberate upon a scheme "for the protection of our Commerce, Finance, and Exchange." The manifesto proposed "a system by which, with the commencement of the new crop, advances on cotton shall be made with the capital or credit of banks here, thereby relieving the consignee in Europe from all care or consideration, except the advantageous sale of his stock." Through arrangements with English manufacturers and the Bank of England, Southern banks would make advances to planters and, on presentation of the proper bills of lading, the banks would issue "Post Notes" which would circulate freely. Ware was probably present at the convention which met in Macon, Georgia, in October, 1839, just as the banks were suspending specie payments in the Southern states and notes were depreciating. The convention adopted resolutions heartily approving the Cotton Circular. Ware was appointed

¹⁵ Ware to Josiah S. Johnston, September 18, 1825, in the collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia.

¹⁶ Eugene C. Barker (ed.), *The Austin Papers*, II, in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1922 (Washington, 1928), 605-606, 613-15, 619, 633-34, 681-82, 691. The first volume of this work was published in the *Annual Report*, 1919 (Washington, 1924); the third by the University of Texas (Austin, 1926).

to the committee for Natchez to make necessary arrangements to carry the plan into effect.¹⁷ But the effort, like so many others based on cotton notes, came to naught.¹⁸

The following years of Ware's life are even more hazy. He remained a Southern planter and slaveowner. From 1844 to 1848 he wrote at least three books.¹⁹ Once again, apparently, he became interested in Texas. He died of yellow fever in 1854, in or near Galveston, where he had apparently invested very heavily in lands.²⁰ The fact that Ware's daughter was later the owner of considerable lands in Texas²¹ may indicate that he held extensive interests there.

It would seem that Ware was a man of broad scientific and intellectual interests. He was interested in botany, geography, the natural sciences, and agriculture, as well as in education and politics. He was familiar with contemporary economic conditions, at home and abroad. Ware's daughter, whom he encouraged in her literary activities, claimed for him a profound learning, but a reserved, shy, even eccentric nature. He was bitter and morose, the result of domestic troubles, even to his friends and children. Ware has been described as a "philosopher of the

¹⁷ Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi, the Heart of the South*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1925), I, 604-605; *id.*, *Encyclopedia of Mississippi History*, 2 vols. (Madison, 1907), II, 158-59, 928-29. The text of the Circular may be found in *Hazard's United States Commercial and Statistical Register* (Philadelphia, 1839-1842), I (1840), 90-92. For the report of the Macon convention, see *ibid.*, 321-24; *Niles' Weekly Register* (Baltimore, 1811-1849), LVII (1839-1840), 184-87.

¹⁸ James L. Watkins, *King Cotton* (New York, 1908), 103; Mitchell, "Nathaniel A. Ware," in *loc. cit.*, 451.

¹⁹ The Boston Public Library has attributed to Ware a series of "Letters on Haiti," published in a slender volume entitled *The Rural Code of Haiti . . . Together with Letters from that Country, By a Southern Planter* (Granville, Middletown, N. J., 1837). The auspices under which the letters were published, the differences in style between them and the *Notes on Political Economy*, the practically irreconcilable inconsistency in the opinions on slavery and Negroes expressed in the two books make it evident that Ware could not have been the author of the "Letters on Haiti." The Library of Congress possesses a copy of *The Rural Code of Haiti*, but attributes the "Letters" to no one. As a result of a detailed analysis of these reasons, the Boston Public Library has accepted the conclusions of the writer.

²⁰ In 1848 he purchased some land near Waco, Texas. Lucy A. Erath, "Memoirs of George Bernard Erath," in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (Austin, 1897-), XXVII (1923-1924), 147. Announcement of Ware's death was made by his step son-in-law at the January 20, 1854, meeting of the American Philosophical Society, *Proceedings* (Philadelphia, 1838-), VI (1859), 5.

²¹ [Tardy], *Southland Writers*, I, 32.

school of Voltaire, a fine scholar, with a pungent, acrid wit, and cold sarcasm." He was a handsome man, "his complexion pure and fair as a young girl's, his cheeks freshly colored, his brow white as a lily,—a very venerable looking man, with long, thin, white locks falling on his neck," and with aquiline nose, high, narrow forehead, and bright eyes.²²

In 1844 Ware wrote *Notes on Political Economy as Applicable to the United States. By a Southern Planter.*²³ In the following year he produced a jeremiad, fairly reeking of pessimism and forebodings of anarchy and ruin, in the form of *An Exposition of the Weakness and Inefficiency of the Government of the United States of North America.*²⁴ This volume has never before been associated with Ware; it has always been attributed to Charles Fenton Mercer, a Virginian, member of Congress, president of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, and active leader in the colonization movement for many years. However, investigation of the District Court Copyright Records of Ohio for the year 1845 brings to light an application for copyright of *An Exposition* made out by Nathaniel A. Ware as *proprietor*.²⁵ The title page of the book contains the imprint "Printed for the Author. 1845." The inference that Ware was the author is therefore inescapable. Further, the title page of a book written by Ware three years later is extraordinarily similar to that of *An Exposition*. Both are anonymous; both were "Printed for the Author"; neither contains, on either side of the title page, the name of the copyright owner. The formats of the title pages are similar in type face and

²² *Ibid.*, 26-27, 31; [Freeman], *Women of the South*, 115.

²³ Published by Leavitt, Trow, and Company at New York, 1844. All sketches of Ware's life mention this volume. Although published pseudonymously, most libraries attribute the volume to him. The only contemporary evidence the writer has been able to find is the fact that Ware is referred to as author of the *Notes*, and quotations from the volume are given in John Pickering, *The Working Man's Political Economy, Founded Upon the Principles of Immutable Justice, and the Inalienable Rights of Man; Designed for the Promotion of National Reform* (Cincinnati, 1847). See, for example, pp. 34, 35-36, 38, 67.

²⁴ N.p., 1845. Cited hereafter as *An Exposition*. Copyright was taken out in Cincinnati. The book was reprinted as *The Weakness and Inefficiency of the Government of the United States . . . By a Late American Statesman. Edited by a Member of the Middle Temple, London* (London, 1863).

²⁵ Credit for the discovery of this fact, as well as the gratitude of the writer, is due Mr. V. Alta Parma, Curator of the Rare Book Collection of the Library of Congress. The District Court Records containing copyrights are in the Rare Book Collection.

make-up, and the word "Printed" in both is identical. Again the inference is that Ware was the author. It is noteworthy, too, that it is generally agreed in nearly all sketches of his life that Ware wrote a book on views of the Federal Constitution. This is undoubtedly *An Exposition*.

An internal examination of the volume yields precisely the same conclusion. There is no evidence whatsoever that Mercer was the author; everything points to Ware. For example, the preface to *An Exposition* declares the author "stands identified"²⁶ with America, and claims he has held offices in "Judicial, Legislative and Executive parts thereof." Mercer had only legislative positions in the government. Ware held executive and legislative positions in Mississippi Territory and, as commissioner of land claims in Florida, he held a quasi-judicial post. The preface claims the author acted "during thirty years of his life, with the Jeffersonian Democracy," and changed only gradually. Mercer had always been either a Federalist or a Whig. The preface claims the author had a family of children and grandchildren. Mercer never married. Ware had two children and, by this time, probably several grandchildren. It is significant that the only lengthy secondary treatment of Mercer, although attributing *An Exposition* to him, is tinged with the distinct feeling that it was out of harmony with Mercer's views.²⁷ A sketch of Mercer's life written by himself in 1849 contains no mention of *An Exposition* despite the fact that he wrote of how busy he had been since his retirement from Congress at the end of 1839, and even gave examples of what he had done.²⁸

The text of the volume itself is so similar to that of *Notes on Political Economy* that one might conclude that the writer had the *Notes* open before him as he wrote. There are identical passages and identical expressions. With the exception of a slight but insignificant difference in attitude toward slavery and war, there is no difference in opinion or point

²⁶ *An Exposition*, vii. Precisely the same expression is used in the Preface to the *Notes*, iii.

²⁷ W. F. Dunaway, "Charles Fenton Mercer" (thesis in the library of the University of Chicago, 1917), 58-59. The author mistakenly asserts that *An Exposition* was posthumous.

²⁸ "Materials for a Life of C. F. Mercer," in James Mercer Garnett, *Biographical Sketch of Hon. Charles Fenton Mercer, 1778-1858* (Richmond, 1911).

of view between *An Exposition* and *Notes on Political Economy*.²⁹ The style is the same—vigorous, relatively dull and harsh, highly repetitious.

In 1848 Ware wrote a novel entitled *Harvey Belden: or a True Narrative of Strange Adventures. By the Author of "Notes on Political Economy," and "A Treatise On the Natural Method of Education."*³⁰ Sketches of his life generally agree in attributing to him a small work on the Pestalozzian system of education, which is undoubtedly *A Treatise*, no copy of which can be found. Furthermore, a biographer of Ware's daughter claimed he wrote a "geographical" novel.³¹ This is probably *Harvey Belden*, which is the story of the son of a rich and respectable Scotch gentleman who, drifting out to sea in a small boat, is found just in time to save his life. With this as a beginning, the novel carries its hero through adventures and misadventures across most of the world—through Portugal, Morocco, the Sahara, eastward across Africa, Persia, India, and China—until the young man is reunited with his father on the Mississippi. The novel seems to have no particular point or moral.

A cursory examination of the files of some of the better contemporary journals, especially on economics, reveals no review or notice of the *Notes on Political Economy*, with which the following discussion will be largely concerned—despite the fact that a biographer of Ware's daughter

²⁹ Cf., for example, passage on reciprocity, *An Exposition*, 108-109, *Notes*, 159-60; passage on Federal courts, *An Exposition*, 25, *Notes*, 25; remarks on Lancastrian system and Girard fund, *An Exposition*, 270, 271, *Notes*, 261, 262-63; passage on slave-run factories, *An Exposition*, 175-76, *Notes*, 31. Note recurrence of expression, "a road, a canal, or a bridge," *Notes*, 266-67, *An Exposition*, 118, 145, 213, 249. At greater length, compare full chapters and sections on mails and the use of franks, in which precisely the same points are made, using the same data, *An Exposition*, 215-20, 370-73, *Notes*, 276-82; on suffrage, *An Exposition*, 38-71, *Notes*, 285 ff., 294 ff.; on the tariff, *An Exposition*, 31-38, *Notes*, 22-35, 89-101. The error of crediting Mercer with the authorship of *An Exposition* probably lies with Joseph Sabin (ed.), *Bibliotheca Americana, A Dictionary of Books Relating to America from Its Discovery to the Present Time*, 29 vols. (New York, 1868-1936), XII (1880), 53-54. I have been unable to find any contemporary connection of the volume with Mercer.

³⁰ Cincinnati, 1848. Credit for the discovery of the novel is, again, due Mr. V. Alta Parma. The only known copy came into his possession early in 1938 and is now in the Henry E. Huntington Library.

³¹ [Tardy], *Southland Writers*, I, 27. The technique of the novel is similar to that of Voltaire in *Candide*—one adventure after another, escape, capture, escape, and recapture, and travel over a large area. There may or may not be any connection between this fact and the statement, on the page cited, that Ware was a "scholar of the school of Voltaire."

claimed Ware's two works on political economy "made some reputation for him among the class of men who take interest in such reasonings."³²

The *Notes on Political Economy*, published in the year of an election, is so thoroughly Whig doctrine as expounded by a Southern aristocrat that it is difficult to avoid the possibility that it was written as campaign propaganda. In the election of 1844, the Whigs "stood out distinctly as the champions of the Union."³³ It requires but a cursory glance at the *Notes* to see that it too was essentially an appeal for support of the Union against sectional, class, and perverse interests. What little we know of Ware marks him as a man of culture and broad interests, with Northern contacts and economic and sentimental ties to the South. This, added to the doctrine enunciated in the *Notes*, where his aristocratic leanings are as evident as his protectionism and nationalism, fits very nicely into the picture of the Southern Whig slaveowner.³⁴ Ware's is certainly the voice of Southern Whiggery, with modifications produced by the influence of the nationalist economists. Nor was it alone. The severe depression which hit the South from 1838 to 1844 called forth a host of economic writings, and it succeeded in turning many planters to protectionist doctrine.³⁵

The *Notes* was written in the course of two years, and so repetitious are its chapters that it would seem they were written at intervals and with little consecutive thought. The volume is abundant in inconsistencies and is by no means a systematic treatment of the subject. There are two dominant ideas which color the entire volume—the second of which forms the connective thread that unites the chapters as well as the excuse for the publication of the book. The first is the concept of relativity in economic doctrine; the idea that economics must be based upon the con-

³² [Tardy], *Southland Writers*, I, 27. The second book on economics may, perhaps, be *An Exposition*. I can find no other book attributable to Ware.

³³ Arthur C. Cole, *The Whig Party in the South* (Washington, 1913), 114.

³⁴ See *ibid.*, 39-104. See, also, Charles S. Sydnor, *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region*, Benjamin L. C. Wailes (Durham, 1938).

³⁵ Ulrich B. Phillips, "Economic and Political Essays," in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, 13 vols. (Richmond, 1909-1913), VII, 176; *id.*, "The Southern Whigs," in *Turner Essays in American History* (New York, 1910), 216. Phillips is the only author this writer has found who actually identifies Ware with Southern Whiggery. See n. 75.

tingencies of time, place, and circumstance; the second is the concept of a national economy, autarchic in character, based upon the harmony of all interests within the nation. It was the vision of an American system which Ware held before him as he wrote, a system which bore a more than incidental resemblance to that of Henry Clay. But, as in the case of Mathew Carey who held the same ideal, an examination of Ware's doctrine yields no "systematic treatise or harmonious economy theory, but a set of rules by which America might direct its economic life."³⁶

Ware defined his political economy, in almost the same terms as Carey, as a "science that embraces and regards all measures calculated to advance the prosperity of a nation." It was essentially a practical science. Smith and Jean Baptiste Say, he believed, were far "too abstract and theoretical for common use." For the subject matter of political economy must be dealt with simply and in such a way as to be understood by the plain working man. Political economy must be empirical; theories must proceed from facts. For to Ware, as to Raymond, Rae, Carey, and Friedrich List, the golden rule of political economy was summed up in the phrase "governed by circumstances."³⁷ He saw no absolute and unique truth for all nations (though, to be sure, he later indicated that all nations become wealthy in proportion to their manufacturing and protection). Like all the nationalist writers, Ware considered the dogmas of the European classical school invalid because of their affirmed universality and entirely unsuited to the United States—which he saw as a new continent with a rapidly increasing population and expanding economy and with almost infinite capacities in land, in natural resources, and in the skill and ingenuity of its people.

Ware distinguished between national and individual wealth, a separation which was more explicit in others of the Carey nationalist group. The heart of his economics lay in the concept, peculiar to the nationalists, of a national productive capacity as the essence of the wealth of the nation. As he said, all his reasoning on protection "applies to the capital or income of a people, nationally speaking; not to individuals." No mat-

³⁶ Rowe, *Mathew Carey*, 67.

³⁷ *Notes on Political Economy*, 1-3.

ter how the national income is divided, it is still realized by the nation.³⁸

It was with this in mind that Ware devoted almost the entire volume of *Notes on Political Economy* to protection and the encouragement of manufactures which, he was certain, was the expedient and necessary policy for the United States if it ever wished to free itself from European (English) domination and assume among the powers of the earth the position which nature and its people are able to provide.

Although Ware saw that until nations were "similarly circumstanced," free trade meant a sort of international slavery, he, like Hamilton before him and Henry C. Carey with him, believed that free trade would be the ultimate product of society, when all nations had fully developed their own resources. Until that day arrived, "the nations of the world will struggle to undersell and overreach each other; and one portion, the active, the free, the skilful, will grow rich and absorb all the capital of the world; and the ignorant, the indolent, the badly governed, and the weak powers, will stand exhausted to such a degree, that at last, from every necessity, they will have to wake up and supply themselves." Once this day had arrived—as it was certain to arrive in the not far distant future—the trade of the world would be only in raw materials and in goods that could not be produced at home.³⁹

Protection was intended to persuade the capitalist to invest money by insuring him against the losses resulting from the transference of capital and the lack of skill and experience that accompany any new enterprise. This bounty, perhaps temporarily a tax, would in the end be worth while, since it would have induced capital and skill into new channels, built up competition, increased the quality and quantity and lowered the prices of goods.⁴⁰ Its aim was to foster manufacturing and hence national self-sufficiency. Only a "bold and far-fetched" distortion of the Constitution could deny to Congress the power to pass protective legislation.⁴¹ And with America in possession of all the essentials of a powerful industrial state, with an abundance of labor, ready capital, tremendous resources in

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 172-73.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 190-92.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 66, 9-11.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 22.

raw materials, and a people of great capacity, intelligence, and ingenuity, there could be no doubt that manufacturing must not "be left to individual exertions, in other words, to chance," that the "attention and protection of the government" must be invoked "to ensure its proper success and development."⁴² With manufactures supported by protection and as the basis of the national economy, the United States must and would prosper. For all the interests and sections of the nation would then be directed toward one end—a true harmony of interests.

To the patriot, a picture of prosperity and national independence is presented that cannot fail to please and delight him,—to the statesman, enough to bring him into the support of all that is wanted to complete and effectuate its realities,—to the agriculturist, a rich harvest and a varied resource,—to the merchant, a better basis of trade, with certain wealth, and fewer dangers,—to the capitalist, a certain and sure employment for his money, and every prospect of an increase of it,—to the slaveholder, some hope of more profit,—and to the manufacturer, the gratitude of his country, as well as a harvest of wealth and comfort. Nothing is wanting but a single act of Congress, giving, in the first instance, the home market, which would be inducement enough to realize the whole, and cover all the ground. Let us up and act, and make our country worth living in.⁴³

With this as his goal, Ware elaborated a plan for eradicating unemployment, increasing agricultural production, and—most important of all—increasing manufacturing, all based on the transportation of rural populations to cities, the reapportionment of employment, and the reclaiming of souls lost through vice, drink, and idleness. The protective bounty would be the means of all this. Manufacturing, encouraged by high tariffs, would create a demand for labor, which would be supplied from three sources: from agricultural groups, 1,000,000, including women and children, who are as valuable as men in factories; from cities, villages, and fishing districts, 500,000; slaves, 400,000; miscellaneous, 100,000. In short, a total of 2,000,000 could be removed from unproductive pursuits in various places and made available as manufacturing labor. This would leave agriculture not only unclogged but in possession of a new market. Dens of vice would be cleared out, and the idle taken from the streets to become more virtuous, happy, and comfortable. In addition, the 2,000,000 would be vastly increased "from the

⁴² *Ibid.*, 25, 26, 35-53.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 157. See, also, 60-61.

very circumstance of protection giving a certainty of employment, by bringing or inducing thousands of the best and most skilful laborers from Europe, and establishing them in this country.”⁴⁴

It was primarily from the point of view of factory employment that Ware was interested in labor, and so much so that he believed “the first duty . . . of all good government, is to look to its labor; insure it not only full occupation, but the greatest productiveness. Political economy abhors idleness worse, if possible, than nature does a vacuum.”⁴⁵ For labor, as Adam Smith posited, was the foundation of all wealth and capital.⁴⁶ Yet it could not govern wages, Ware believed, for competition of labor and machinery would bring wages down to subsistence level and “in the run of things man . . . [was] destined to sell himself for bread and clothes, and perhaps brown bread and rags at that.” Nor could labor have a hand in price, for price—here Ware followed the lead of Ricardo’s American imitators—was mechanically governed by supply and demand alone.⁴⁷

This emphasis on manufacturing may seem unusual in a planter, but Ware found opportunity to pay at least perfunctory respects to agriculture, which, he wrote somewhat inconsistently, was “the real basis of the world’s prosperity and support,” “the very foundation of our subsistence and wealth.” Early in the volume he said that “Applying any more labor to any branch of agriculture would be the utmost folly.” At the end he was enthusiastically advocating the introduction of new staples, such as “silk, indigo, grape, olive, more sugar and wool, madder and woad.” All this could be done not “at the expense of any other production, but greatly to the relief of all, as all are overdone, and could well spare labor.”⁴⁸ Ware wrote some illuminating passages on cotton culture. He suggested fixing prices at a rate which would increase demand tremendously and would at the same time make foreign competition impossible.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 28-34.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 135. See, also, *ibid.*, 7.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 134, 205.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 78-79, 209.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 35, 119, 297-304.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 101-15.

An excellent example of Ware's efforts to direct all the resources of the nation towards the development of manufacturing and national self-sufficiency was his attitude toward the problem of slavery. Like the other nationalist economists, he understood—but passively and rather dispassionately—the moral issue involved. He saw the "horrors of slavery" and "its moral turpitude." "On all these points," he wrote, "there can be but one opinion, if the thing had to be gone over again."⁵⁰ But he also believed Negroes were racially inferior, and wore "the eternal mark of degradation . . . fixed, both by nature and fact." He was certain that freedom would make the Negro "infinitely more immoral and worthless," and that colonization was impossible. "Slavery, then, will remain among us, mix in with the population in the long run of circumstances, and is destined to form the stamina of population, particularly in the delta of the Mississippi river."⁵¹

But Ware saw that the institution was a part of the national economy and therefore demanded the attention of the economist. He saw that slavery was an economic disadvantage, and had squeezed free labor out of a large portion of the country. But he evidently believed it would ultimately become extinct—at the moment when it would no longer be profitable to the slaveowner, when population had become so dense that free labor would be as cheap as slave labor.⁵² By what process this was to come about, he did not indicate. As to the time involved, Ware once suggested fifty years; at another time, a "century or two"; at still another, "ere long."⁵³

Forced, then, upon the United States by "adamantine circumstances," slavery should be shunted into productive labors, should be metamorphosed from a clog on the market and a liability into a national resource and a source of labor. To what better use could the 400,000 slaves who could be easily removed from unprofitable agriculture in the border states be put than manufacturing? These slaves, Ware believed, could do the work as well as whites, and much more cheaply. Such work

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 200.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 250, 228.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 11, 173, 201, 203-204, 227-28.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 101, 32, 106.

would be more humane to the slave, for he would be better off indoors in a warm building than "exposed half clad on the farms, amid swamps and rain." On the other hand, slave labor in factories would exempt "to that extent free people, and particularly delicate females and children, from factory drudgery and labor. . . . let us bestow upon them," Ware wrote, "the worst, most unhealthy and degrading sort of duties and labor, to the exemption of free persons. This would shock humanity no more than slavery does, and make freedom more dignified and valuable."⁵⁴

In short, Ware made no effort really to alleviate the condition of the slave, or to solve the social and moral problem posed by the institution. On the contrary, he accepted it, with a wry face to be sure, and attempted merely to change it into "an efficient labor for the prosperity of the country."⁵⁵ Here Ware differed from most writers of the nationalist school. They were, by and large, active abolitionists; and those who advocated the placement of Negroes in factories did so on the basis of free Negroes. Mathew Carey, closest to Ware's point of view, believed slavery must inevitably remain, but at least thought colonization possible. But Ware's views are certainly more to be expected from a Southern planter and slaveowner.⁵⁶

Another subject to which Ware directed his attention was population. By and large, he, like the nationalists in general, was unfavorable to the Malthuso-Ricardian doctrine, although his views on population were often similar to those of Malthus. Like Hamilton fifty years earlier, he recognized the importance of a "full and efficient population in all countries, for the defence, wealth, and refinement, that ought to accompany every government or association of the human family."⁵⁷ So essential was this in his political economy, that it was one of his main arguments

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 30-34.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 204.

⁵⁶ It is worthy of note that Ware argued against expansion not only on grounds of population density but also because it would give slavery a new lease on life. *Ibid.*, 231, 227.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 246. See Turner, *Ricardian Rent Theory*; Joseph J. Spengler, "Population Theory in the Ante-Bellum South," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), II (1936), 360; and *id.*, "Population Doctrines in the United States, I. Anti-Malthusianism," in *Journal of Political Economy* (Chicago, 1892-), XLI (1933), 433.

in opposing westward expansion.⁵⁸ Like Malthus, Ware believed "The natural check and limit to an increase of population is the capacity of the earth to support it and feed it. To this point it tends, and nothing in the end can prevent its reaching this maximum."⁵⁹ But Ware found all this no cause for pessimism. For his faith in the power of new agronomic methods and scientific progress was the solution to one factor, the ability of the earth to yield. And for the second factor, the birth rate, Ware pointed out the healthful effect of raising the standard of living. Like Raymond, Ware believed "pride" and style were wholesome checks on population.⁶⁰

If Ware never offered a theory of rent or discussed it at length as Henry C. Carey did, there is one at least implicit in a passage of the *Notes on Political Economy*; and, if we may take the italicized words at their face value, it contains the kernel of what was, forty years later, to figure so prominently in Henry George's economic philosophy.

Again, [wrote Ware,] *the advance of population and wants in all countries, make the lands valuable*. Whole quarters of cities and villages, and dense settlements, grow upon the *lazy accidental landholders*. . . . I could number half a million of substantial farmers in the United States, East and West, who *became men of substance by the growth of the country around them*, lands rising from a quarter dollar an acre up to sixty, whilst they were in the mean time struggling with an overloaded market, and making nothing but a bare support on their farms.⁶¹

Like Hamilton and the nationalist school, Ware believed internal improvements were fundamental to the development of the nation and must be counted as part of its wealth. The public lands could be used to pay for these improvements, if they were not already being used to subsidize public education.⁶²

⁵⁸ *Notes on Political Economy*, 227. See, also, *ibid.*, 90-91. It is significant that although Ware opposed expansion, he included the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Coast regions in his appraisal of America's resources, *ibid.*, 52; and considered Texas in discussing America's capacity for producing cotton, although he expressly warned against its acquisition, *ibid.*, 102.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 247.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 190-91, 247-49. Ware believed poor laws created pauperism and that "it would be to the interest of society to kill off" all "drones" and "excrescences" who depend on public charity. *Ibid.*, 194-99.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 215. Italics are the writer's.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 193-94, 255-56, 266-82.

He believed, again taking his cue from Hamilton, that the capitalist should be identified with the nation, partly through the medium of the national debt, partly through the ownership of labor resources and raw materials. Capital should be so arranged "as to make it the interest of the owners that the country should be steady, orderly, and undisturbed by changes of any sort. Capitalists then stand upon the watchtowers, the great policies of the nation, and guard its best and most substantial interests."⁶³ But whether the national debt is good or bad depends, he said, upon whether or not it is owned by the citizens of the nation in question and upon whether it is heavy enough to become a tax on labor. Under favorable conditions, he wrote, echoing Hamilton's very words, the debt is a blessing: "It cements and consolidates the fabric of a government, by making the most sordid concerned in its prosperity. . . . Such a debt comports with patriotism," and it should not be paid off, but rather kept as an encouragement to capital.⁶⁴

Like Mathew Carey, Ware believed that capital and currency should be proportional to trade, and that an increase in the latter necessitated an increase in the former. Like Carey again, he declared currency must rest on a metallic basis and upon the credit of the government. It is noteworthy that Ware's attitude here, not emphatically in favor of a national bank, fitted into the 1844 Whig platform of a "well-regulated" currency.

That the orbit of Ware's political economy had its center in the nation is evident. He was a nationalist and centralist, and the entire volume reflects that attitude. Yet, as his prejudices and political ideology unfold, Ware's association with Southern Whig doctrine becomes ever more obvious. The Whig party owed its origin to a strange coalition of opponents to Jacksonian Democracy; nowhere was this more evident than in the South, where state rightists and National Republicans joined hands against the Democrats. But by the early forties, when Ware wrote, Southern Whiggery had been cleansed of its radical elements and its advocates were fairly united in subordinating sectionalism to the

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 139-40.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 223-25.

cause of national party harmony.⁶⁵ By this time, too, the strength of the Southern Whigs lay in the slaveowning aristocracy. Ware's attitude toward democracy coincided with that of these ante-bellum "princes of privilege," and therein lies his only significant departure from the ideas of the national economists.

The nationalists, with few exceptions (as List), agreed with Ware in believing that the United States should be governed in the Federalist tradition. Ware was emphatic on this point. His criticism of the principles of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Democracy, his firm belief that all prejudice and antiprotectionism flowed from "party-feeling," his charges of corruption against the Jackson, Van Buren, and Tyler administrations, his repeated condemnation of "state-right sticklers" and other special interests which exist at the expense of the nation, were certainly reflections of Clay dogma.⁶⁶ "The absurdities of our politics," Ware wrote, ". . . are more mysterious than the Egyptian Sphinx or the Delphian Oracle; and the motives that inclined our politicians to such things are entirely inexplicable on any principles that ordinarily govern men."⁶⁷ Ware suggested war as a cure for the troubles that were leading America to anarchy and ruin; that alone would "lift us above all this meanness and local feeling, and make and preserve us a nation." Wars in general, he believed, throw a people on its resources, sharpen its wits, and teach it real independence, and when "waged in a spirit of civilization," they are a necessary stimulus to all peoples, for "Nations, like individuals, require excitement."⁶⁸

Education, too, attracted Ware's attention, and his discussion of it was colored by his economic attitude. He was emphatic in his advocacy of public, government supported and regulated education which, he believed, was "a national concern, a first duty, and the only true support any free institutions can have, upon which to depend with certainty." Pointing out that "A general suffrage without education is sure ruin to

⁶⁵ Phillips, "The Southern Whigs," in *loc. cit.*, 216; Cole, *Whig Party in the South*, Chap. III.

⁶⁶ See, for instance, *Notes on Political Economy*, 126, 218-19, 75-76, 226-27, 257, 158-61, 280, 24-25.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 270-71.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 216-20.

any government," he belittled the "sticklers for state rights" and the "anti-federal or democratic party" which denied to the government the power to legislate for education.⁶⁹ He suggested that the Lancastrian monitorial system be spread throughout the nation, even in night schools for workers.⁷⁰ He warned, too, that there must be "no distinction by separate classing of the poor and rich in the primary schools; the poor scholar, who is educated at the public charge, should not know it, nor the others with whom he studies, lest he be mortified and depressed, and become a butt or mark for the others."⁷¹

His concern for education was presumably for the purpose of building up an intelligent and responsible public opinion upon which every democracy is dependent.⁷² But Ware was by no means democratic in his political philosophy. The Southern Whig-planter aristocracy of his day fought hard to maintain its privilege against what it believed to be the disorganizing and leveling tendencies of the Democrats on whom it looked with "mingled contempt and fear."⁷³ This was precisely Ware's attitude; and the opinions he incorporated in his chapter on "Representation, Public Opinion, Suffrage," smack of the Hamiltonian "The People is a beast." Only the "worth, and intelligence and substance of the land," he believed, stand forth as the champions of human rights. A suffrage not based on property qualifications becomes the tool of designing politicians. And there is soon produced in the rabble a feeling "against all the wealth, intelligence, and refinement in the country, which they are taught to brand as aristocrats and proud, and a total separation takes place very much to the injury to both."⁷⁴ Although the entire matter rests in a haze of confused thoughts, it is evident that Ware believed in government by the rich and intelligent, by those sufficiently wealthy and educated to have a personal interest in stability and strong central government.⁷⁵

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 255, 259.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 95, 155-56, 229, 261, 262.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 261.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 282-84.

⁷³ Cole, *Whig Party in the South*, 70, 73.

⁷⁴ *Notes on Political Economy*, 293-97. See, also, *ibid.*, 284-86.

⁷⁵ Lengthy quotations from *Notes on Political Economy* appear in Calvin Colton, *The*

The *Notes on Political Economy* was by no means so optimistic as the works of the other nationalist economists generally were. To be sure, it pictured the glorious possibilities of the United States and its future; but it contained, too, a reproach for opportunities missed, for errors made by the American government in its half-century of existence, and warnings of what might be expected under a Democratic regime. But in *An Exposition*, written only one year later, Ware's mood had changed entirely. Optimism is completely gone, even warnings are lacking; there is only recollection of what might have been had America acted wisely, dire forebodings of the anarchy, ruin, and distress that will visit America in the near future, and an analysis of the forces which make that future inevitable. The book is literally a lament. Ware was convinced of the debacle; he sincerely believed a new French Revolution was in the offing, when the American confederation would revert to its original entities and to anarchy. The change in mood was in all probability stimulated by the defeat suffered by Clay and the Whigs in the presidential election of the previous year. The entire volume seems to be the product of a soured and pessimistic man of substance, disappointed by what appeared to him the disappearance of all that was good in his political and social ideology and by the magnification of those forces which he believed would inevitably destroy him, his class, and the American Union.⁷⁶ A partial stimulus might also be found in the fact that the Old Natchez

Life and Times of Henry Clay, 2 vols. (New York, 1846), II, 273-88, 464, 478. "The great opposition to the protective policy," Colton wrote, ". . . has arisen from the southern planting interest. But Mr. Clay, 'a Southern Planter,' and many others, have proved conclusively, that this policy is equally important to the south as to the north." "That such a voice [as Ware's] should come forth from . . . [the South] was perhaps unexpected. It cannot be denied, that the teachings of this work—they are very strong—are worthy of special regard on account of this origin." Similar quotations and comments appear in *id.*, *Public Economy for the United States* (New York, 1845), 490-92, 493, 535-36. One of the impressions left with the reader is that Ware is being identified with Southern Whiggery. Of much greater interest are the comments in Pickering, *Working Man's Political Economy*. Pickering, a free trader, abolitionist, and Democrat, claimed all books previous to his had been written by monarchists or monied aristocrats. He identified Ware as one of the latter. He was definitely associated with the rich capitalists who exploited the poor. Pickering went so far as to suggest the title for a new work on economics: "Political Economy: Devoted to the interests of the King, and the Capitalist: . . . By Malthus, Colquhoun, Smith, Say, Blake, Ware, and Many Others." See *ibid.*, 34, 35-36, 38, 67.

⁷⁶ "Never again," Ware lamented, "will we have a Whig or an honest administration!" The Whigs, under Clay, had made their last effort. "They now give up the ship and await the catastrophe that impends over the country." *An Exposition*, 69, 70-71.

Region, which was the center of the aristocracy and Whiggery of Mississippi, and with which we may be justified in associating Ware, lost more and more of its influence in state affairs in the course of the forties. And with the passing of the years, the Whigs gradually were "metamorphosed from a political party into a social class, and the word 'Whig' came to denote little more than an aristocratic way of life."⁷⁷

There is no significant change in Ware's ideas or opinions accompanying this change of mood. His attitude toward abstractions and theorizing, his views on manufacturing and protective tariffs, on internal improvements, on banking and currency, on education, on the mails, on the poor, on expansionism, on state rights, are substantially the same, though dealt with in less detail than in the *Notes*.⁷⁸

The bulk of the text is devoted to an expansion and analysis of Ware's assertions that "the Government of the United States of North America is extremely defective, and carries in its bosom the seeds of its own destruction," and that "the greatest defect in the structure of this government, and the most sure to operate her ruin, is her Federative form."⁷⁹ Ware claimed no confederation had ever succeeded, and he went into great detail to show how local loyalties and state rights had succeeded in undermining the American Union, with the result that the Constitution had become utterly worthless. All this was, to a large extent, the result of the "damnable policy of Thomas Jefferson and his party," and of Andrew Jackson, who "combined most curiously and most fatally a despotism and a demagogue spirit, that did every thing under names that had become dear to the people, such as Democracy and Jeffersonian principles."⁸⁰

Ware rang in all their changes and almost *ad nauseam* his accusations of the "dangerous statesman" Jefferson, of state righters, and of those who believed in democracy. He was still convinced that the general suffrage was one of the fatal causes of disunion.⁸¹ He strenuously attacked

⁷⁷ Sydnor, *Benjamin L. C. Wailes*, 290-91.

⁷⁸ *An Exposition*, 213-15, 335-36, 31-38, 357-61, 151-60, 368-70, 262-72, 352-56, 215-20, 370-73, 189-92, 373-75, 25-28, 128-43.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 258, 260. See, also, 234-62, 45-46, 50, 86.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 38-71, 325-29.

the immigration policy which gave citizenship to those who had no feelings of citizenship and which brought disruptive elements to America.⁸² He inveighed especially against the Irish for their corruption, stupidity, and radicalism.⁸³ He wrote violently against party spirit and corruption in government.⁸⁴ He declared there was no assurance in America for the protection of life and property.⁸⁵ Although he wanted a dense population, he realized that the effects of popular suffrage were most severe in the cities, where population was most concentrated, where immigrants were plentiful, and where people were the poorest.⁸⁶

Ware expressed himself much more emphatically against slavery in *An Exposition* than he did in the *Notes*. The reason for the change lay at least partly in his conviction that slavery "unquestionably turned the scale in the last Presidential election, and ensured the triumph of democracy."⁸⁷ More significant than Ware's woeful picture of the sad lot of both slave and free Negro,⁸⁸ was his description of the debilitating influence of slavery upon slaveowners and the Southern states. Himself a slaveowner, Ware wrote:

The morals . . . of the slave States must, in the very nature of the case, be comparatively bad, must be reckless, arrogating, presuming, unamiable, and dissipated, and the high moral tone and pride they assume, do not compensate for the want of purity in their character, the want of amiableness in their manners, the want of regularity in their habits, and a just punctuality in their dealings. . . . Their acts are often generous, but their generosity is impulsive; and the patronage they lend to the arts, either vouchsafed or flows from pride rather than any love of the more refined sciences.⁸⁹

Abolitionism Ware likened to the European Crusades. It would, he felt, inevitably absorb all the parties in the North, for as its influence increased, parties would see that victory could be won only by alliances with it. "Then a new era will dawn, and this geographical line between the free and the slave States, be marked in blood." Thus abolitionism,

⁸² *Ibid.*, 39-41, for example.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 66, 80-81, 255.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 72-90.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 285-301.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 325-27.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 177.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 66, 167-85, 331-33.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 168-69, 171-73.

irresistible, would be the means, not of freeing the slaves, but of destroying the Union. For Ware was still convinced that to free the slaves would do more harm than good, and that slavery would remain in America until white labor should be cheap enough to replace it.⁹⁰

Nothing but Ware's own words can do justice to his description of the impending crisis.

When the great cauldron [of democracy] boils and casts up its scum and froth, it will roll over the bounds assigned to it, and overwhelm in its turmoil all in its way, not only those intended to be the victims [the rich], but those who reared it up and vainly hoped to lead or control it [the Democratic party]. As happened in the French Revolution, the tools and minions of the designing politicians will rise above and first set their foot on the necks of their leaders, and those who taught them the scent of blood, and to desecrate religion and private property. The tide that rolls on bears down all. The dregs of the poisoned chalice has to be drunk by the persons who mixed it for their betters. The anarchy that follows such an outbreak throws up, to prominent and conspicuous action, some strong energy, that seizes the monster entangled in its own toils, and establishes a despotism as the only thing that can cure the disorders of society. Thus ends the chapter of the general suffrage! Thus will end the Union! Thus will disperse to its original elements the confederation! Say not that this picture is hypothetical and conjured up by the imagination! It is the truth of history, the embodiment of the past, the denouement of poor human nature's drama.⁹¹

Thus will vanish the world's "great experiment in Liberty,"⁹² and "we shall be the mockery of nations, the unworthy guardians of liberty, and traitors to her holy cause."⁹³

The following passage provides the best summation of Ware's ideal political society:

My government should be a Republic—the Legislature Representative—the Executive for not less than a ten years term, and then not re-eligible—my Judges for life, and independent—my Electors should have a real estate property qualification—my salaries should be liberal—my punishments certain and severe enough to deter vice—my public virtues should all be rewarded by proper monuments and notices—my public servants, when growing old, be pensioned—my education be a National concern, and embracing all—my Religions all tolerated, and left to voluntary support—my National defences ample, without being too expensive—my Revenues from imposts as far as possible—my Manufacturing in-

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 281, 283, 284, 184-85.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 9-10, 90.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 123.

dustry protected, up to national supply at least.—No slavery—no poor laws, beyond infirmaries. One National bank to aid the revenues, and a National repository.—All the internal improvements possible. I would patronize the Arts—all mechanical inventions be rewarded, and secured to the inventors.—Museums of Natural history, of agricultural improvements, and such branches as are useful, be got up and kept for inspection.—My intercourse with other nations honorable and courteous.—My naturalization laws insure that foreigners had become citizens in feeling, before they enjoyed the privileges of citizens.—My Territories should not exceed six to eight hundred miles square, nor embrace more than eight or ten degrees of latitude.—I will have as little constitution as possible, or the rules and dictations of such an instrument, and no confederation—no trial by jury.⁹⁴

Of all the nationalists, Ware stood closest to Mathew Carey. In several particulars only did they differ. Carey believed colonization possible; Ware did not. Carey had a deep, humanitarian sympathy for the poor and believed relief imperative upon the wealthy; Ware treated the masses like so many ergs of industrial energy. Neither Carey nor the other nationalists, with the exception of their father, Hamilton, believed it necessary to abstract the *demos* from democracy, as Ware did. Carey was fundamentally enthusiastic and saw a splendid future for America. Ware, too, saw possibilities; but, soured by the sixteen years from Jackson through Tyler, and curdled by the election of Polk, his optimism turned to gloom. Carey's economics was hardly more than a set of variations of Hamilton's Report on Manufactures.⁹⁵ And the same is largely true of Ware's.

Ware's membership in the nationalist school is unmistakable. But he must also be identified with Southern Whiggery. His opinions and attitudes were fundamentally the same as those of the slaveowning aristocracy of which he was a member. But he differed from his fellow Southern aristocrats occasionally. They probably would not have accepted his ideas on population and expansion. They certainly would not have subscribed to his philippic against slavery, and it is not difficult to understand why he did not sign his name to the tirade against the slave-owner included in *An Exposition*, although his conclusions on slavery itself were often accepted in the South by his class.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 336-37.

⁹⁵ Rowe, *Mathew Carey*, 114.

Notes and Documents

THE MONTGOMERY ADDRESS OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

Edited by DAVID R. BARBEE and MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR.

One of Douglas's biographers has pointed out that, although the Illinois Democrat soon realized the hopelessness of his campaign of 1860, "he knew he was the head of the true party of Jefferson, he felt that the old Union would not stand if he was beaten. He was the leader of a forlorn hope, but he led it superbly well. He undertook a canvass of the country the like of which no candidate had ever made before."¹ Others have shown that Douglas was well aware of the danger he ran in speaking in the South, but was not thereby deterred from invading the slave states and asserting therein that Lincoln's election would not justify secession. Nor did the knowledge of this danger prevent his speaking at several places in the home state of the Apostle of Secession, William Lowndes Yancey.² As early as October 8, when he learned that Indiana and Pennsylvania had gone Republican, Douglas was convinced that Lincoln would be elected. It was then that he decided to go South and make a last effort to save the Union.³ The speech subjoined, delivered from the steps of the state capitol at Montgomery, Alabama, on the afternoon of November 2, 1860, was one of the final gestures in that patriotic but futile effort. On the preceding evening, while Douglas was being escorted to his hotel by a torchlight procession, some of the disaffected in the community hurled two mature eggs and some tomatoes at

¹ William G. Brown, *Stephen Arnold Douglas* (Boston, 1902), 135.

² George F. Milton, *The Eve of Conflict, Stephen A. Douglas and the Needless War* (Boston, 1934), 497-99; Allen Johnson, *Stephen A. Douglas* (New York, 1908), 438; Henry P. Willis, *Stephen A. Douglas* (Philadelphia, 1910), 322.

³ Milton, *The Eve of Conflict*, 499.

him. Fortunately, they missed their target and struck some of the local reception committee.⁴

Though some of the Douglas biographers have been aware of this speech, none, so far as the editors know, has quoted it; nor does it appear in any collection of the addresses of Douglas. The reason is not far to seek. It was delivered only four days before the momentous election of 1860, and probably appeared only in the Montgomery papers. By the time these reached most of their exchanges, the election was over, and perceptive editors realized that its arguments would fall on deaf ears.

As will appear from parenthetical insertions, the audience applauded the oratory of Douglas—but they did not vote for him.⁵ Today the reader may find the speech very convincing; at least, it is an excellent summary of the Douglas view of the slavery question as it related to the territories, particularly of the doctrine of nonintervention. One wonders why it did not have more effect upon those who heard it. There are numerous explanations possible, each of which, probably, was only a factor. For one thing, popular sovereignty, as interpreted by Douglas, had been repudiated by the great majority of Southern Democrats by 1860. For another, the Rhettts and Yanceys and Toombses were too shrewd to relax their efforts even at the eleventh hour. Douglas spoke at midday. The same evening Yancey replied.⁶ Another probable factor is that many of Douglas's auditors who attended closely and applauded loudly were swayed merely by the emotion of the moment, by mass psychology; but in their calmer moments they did not trust Douglas. While to posterity he seems to have been sincerely devoted to his avowed

⁴ Henry Wilson, *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America*, 3 vols. (Boston, 1876-1878), II, 700.

⁵ The same issue of the *Montgomery Confederation*, November 9, 1860, which carried Douglas's speech gave early election returns from several states, indicating that Lincoln had been elected. It also carried the results of the election in Montgomery and in Montgomery County. At the Courthouse Breckinridge received 361, Bell, 280, and Douglas, 49; Exchange: Breckinridge, 457, Bell, 297, and Douglas, 63; Harrogate Springs: Breckinridge, 37, Bell, 11, and Douglas, 3; Rives: Breckinridge, 37, Bell, 10, and Douglas, 0. In the state of Alabama, Breckinridge received 48,831, Bell, 27,875, and Douglas, 13,651. Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1924), I, 297.

⁶ J. W. DuBose, *Life and Times of William Lowndes Yancey* (Birmingham, 1892), 534-35.

principle of "popular sovereignty," to many of his contemporaries it seemed but the opportunist expedient of a very clever demagogue.

One of the leaders of the Union element of Alabama was J. J. Seibels, founder and editor of the Montgomery *Confederation*, daily and weekly, published by Edwin A. Banks and George W. Dickey. Doubtless the speech quoted below appeared in the daily issue for November 3. Certainly it appeared in the weekly for November 9. All files of the daily have disappeared except those for 1859 and the first half of 1860, which are now in the Library of Congress. But in the office of the Montgomery *Advertiser* are preserved some files of the weekly *Confederation*. While seeking for information about John Wilkes Booth's sojourn in Montgomery in the autumn of 1860, an assistant of Mr. Barbee's found this speech and drew it to his attention. It is a startling reflection that perhaps both Booth and Yancy were in Douglas's audience that day. With what varied emotions they must have listened!

JUDGE DOUGLAS said: Fellow citizens of Alabama, I sincerely trust that the bright and genial sun which has succeeded the dark and stormy night through which we have just passed, may be auspicious of a brilliant and happy future for our common country.—[Cheers.] The Republic is now involved in darkness, and surrounded with those elements of discord which inspire the patriot["]s hearts with dread. I sincerely cherish the hope that the light of reason and patriotism will enter the hearts of our countrymen, and guide their action in such direction as will save the Republic from this threatened disaster. I believe that if we are faithful to the Constitution, as our fathers made it, there is no grievance of which any portion of our people complain, but what can be remedied under the Constitution and within the Union. [“That’s true,” “that’s the doctrine,” and cheers.] I regard this Union as the greatest blessing ever conferred upon a free people. I know but one mode by which this Union can be preserved, and that is by maintaining inviolate every provision of the Constitution. [Cheers.] Every right secured by that instrument, every obligation imposed by it must be protected and performed in good faith. [“That’s it” and cheers.]

The abolitionists of the North profess a willingness to abide by and carry out all the provisions of the Constitution with one or two exceptions. When I took the oath of fidelity to the Constitution of the United States, I found no exceptions in the oath. [“That’s right,” “Bully for you” and cheers.] Every man who holds office under the Federal Government, or under a State Government, takes an oath to support the Constitution without any exceptions, and yet the

Abolitionists, or the Republicans as they choose to call themselves, tell us that their consciences will not permit them to obey these clauses of the Constitution, which provide for the surrender of fugitive slaves. I never yet knew an Abolitionist so conscientious that he would not accept office under the government. [Laughter and applause.] I never knew one so conscientious that he would not take an oath of fidelity to the Constitution, in all of its parts, in order to get possession of his office. [Laughter.] I want no man to represent me or to administer power over me who will take an oath of fidelity to the Constitution in order to get possession of his office, with a mental reservation that when in office he will violate both the Constitution and his oath. [“That’s true,” “Hurrah for Douglas” and cheers.] I hold that when any man becomes so conscientious that he cannot obey the Constitution of his country in all of its parts, he ought to be too honest and too conscientious to receive protection under it. The Constitution as our fathers made it is good enough for me. Every duty imposed by it, every obligation to be enforced under it, I am prepared to perform in good faith. Let this be done and there will be no cause for strife or ill feeling between the different portions of this Union.

The only question which now disturbs our harmony and generates hostility, is that of African slavery. [Cheers.] This question existed when the government was made; but there was peace in it for the first thirty years after the Constitution was established. Let us inquire upon what principle the government was framed and was administered during the time there was peace on this question, with a view of ascertaining whether if we return to the same policy we can enjoy the same blessings. When this government was made, it was composed of free and slaveholding States. Some few of the slaveholding States had taken initiatory steps to become free States. The doctrine did not prevail at that day which is now proclaimed by Mr. Lincoln and his abolition allies, that these States must all be free or all be slave, in order to maintain the Union. Our fathers had too much sense to entertain any such doctrines. The framers of our Constitution knew that in a country as broad as this, with such a variety of soil, climate and productions, there must necessarily be a corresponding variety of interests requiring different laws and different institutions, adapted to the wants and interests of each locality. They knew that the laws and institutions which would suit the granite hills of New England, would be unsuited to the rice, cotton and sugar plantations of the South. Hence our system of government rests on the basis that the Federal Government must exercise only such powers as are national and relate to the whole country without interfering with the domestic affairs of the people. It was supposed at that day that each State had interests different from every other one, and accordingly would require different legislation and institutions. The Federal Constitution was made on this theory. So far as the question of slavery was concerned, it received careful consideration in the convention and was placed upon a basis that every man

thought could never be disturbed by federal power. Remember that at that period the Constitution was made there was a strong abolition feeling, even in Virginia. Gov. [George] Mason in the Convention made speeches on the subject of slavery more radical, revolutionary, dangerous, and offensive than any that were ever made by Seward, or Lincoln, or Sumner. The anti-slavery party of that day demanded that the Convention should insert a clause in the Constitution, prohibiting the African slave trade as immoral and unchristian. The representatives of Georgia and South Carolina who were more interested in slavery than the representatives of any other State, at once told the Convention that if they inserted a clause in the Constitution which placed an institution of their States under the ban morally and religiously, they would never enter the Union. They brought the Convention to a dead stand, and forced the anti-slavery sentiment to yield. The consequence was, the adoption of the provisions of the Constitution, by which each could, if it choose [*sic*] engage in the slave trade up to the year 1808, but after that Congress might prohibit it. That provision waived the moral and religious objection. That provision recognised slavery as legitimate commerce or traffic, and made its perpetuation or abolition a question of expediency, and not of moral. On that basis the African slave trade was adjusted.

The agitation of the question, however, alarmed the Southern Representatives, who feared that in the process of time the abolitionists of the North should obtain possession of the Government, they might divest the title of slave property by federal law. Hence, Southern men would not consent that the title to their slaves should be dependent upon any federal power. And they demanded the insertion of a clause in the Federal Constitution recognizing their right of property in their slaves as existing not under the Constitution of the United States—not under the laws of Congress—not under federal authority; but as existing in each State under the laws *thereof*. [Cheers.] Read the clause in the Constitution as it now stands upon the subject of fugitive slaves, and you will see how cautiously the framers of the Government guarded slave property from federal interference. I will quote the clause: "No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall be released by any law or regulation therein, but shall be delivered up." A slave is a person held to service, or labor in one State under the laws thereof. Not under the laws of Congress—not under the Constitution of the United States—not under federal authority; *but in a State under the laws thereof*—beyond the reach of Congress—beyond the touch of federal power, where abolitionism cannot interfere with it.—[Cheers.] Hence your title to your slave property is expressly recognized by the Federal Constitution as existing under your own laws, where no power on earth but yourselves can interfere with it. Such are the provisions of the Constitution, so far as they relate to the State.

Now let us inquire how it stands with the Territories. In the absence of

any express provisions on the subject with reference to the Territories, the fair inference would be that the same principles which applied to the States also applied to the Territories. ['Right.'] Such was the construction placed upon the Constitution by its founders. The first act of Congress in relation to slavery was passed in 1793, and it was known as the original fugitive slave law, approved by Washington, when Jefferson and [Edmund] Randolph were in his cabinet, and Madison was the leading man in Congress. Read the first section of the fugitive slave act of 1793, and you will find that it declares that any person held to service or labor in either of the States of this Union, or in any organized Territory, *under the laws thereof*, escaping, shall be delivered up. Thus you find that by that act slaves were to be held in the Territories the same as in the States, under the laws thereof, beyond the reach of Congress to interfere. That fugitive slave law still stands on the statute books, and it has been adjudged to be Constitutional and valid by the Supreme Court of the United States in two decisions, if not more. As the law now stands, therefore, slaves are to be held in the Territories the same as in the States, "under the laws thereof." [Cheers.] The Federal Government was administered on that policy up to 1820, when the memorable Missouri controversy arose. Up to that time Congress had never attempted to interfere with slavery either in the States or in the Territories. During that period many new States were admitted into the Union, and many Territories were organized by Congress. The Territories thus organized were not only those on the West side of the Mississippi, acquired from France; but included Mississippi and Alabama. Look into the act of Congress organizing the territory of Alabama, and you will find no provision prohibiting slavery on the one hand, or establishing it on the other. ['That's so,' 'That's true,' and cheers.] Examine every one of those Territorial acts, from the adoption of the federal Constitution down to 1820, and you will find no attempt in any of them, either to maintain and protect slavery, or to abolish and prohibit it. Congress then acted on the true principle of the Constitution in organizing Territorial governments, and left the people free to have slavery just as long as they wanted it, and to get rid of it when they got tired of it. [Cheers.] So long as Congress acted on that principle of non-intervention on the subject of slavery there was peace between the North and the South, and harmony between the free and the slave States; but the first time that it attempted to touch the question anywhere with the view of controlling it a sectional strife arose which came very near dissolving this glorious Union.

You all remember the great controversy of 1820 on the Missouri question. That controversy originated in the attempt of Congress to interfere with the question first in the State of Missouri, and secondly in the Territory of Arkansas. The doctrine of Congressional interference with slavery had its origin in the Hartford Convention, which was held during the last war⁷ by the old blue light

⁷ Douglas evidently meant "the last war with England," as the Mexican War, as well as the Seminole and Black Hawk wars were subsequent to the War of 1812.

federalists. ("That's so," "hit them again," laughter and cheers.)—By their treason to the country the federalists had rendered their party so odious that it was necessary to seize upon some new element of agitation to revive their broken and sinking fortunes. (Cheers.) They accordingly originated the scheme of thrusting the slavery question into Congress, claiming Congressional power over the subject, and then insisting that there should be no more slave States brought into the Union. The first opportunity they had of carrying out this federal scheme arose in 1820, when Missouri applied for admission as a State and Arkansas for organization as a Territory. Rufus King, the chief of the old federal party, proposed to put a restriction on the State of Missouri, keeping her out of the Union until she changed her constitution and abolished slavery. He also proposed to prohibit slavery in the Territory of Arkansas and the balance of our territories forever.⁸ The Southern men, senators and representatives, without distinction of party, denounced the proposition as an usurpation of power on the part of the Federal Government not delegated in the Constitution. (Cheers.) Read the report of the great Lowndes, or the speeches of Henry Clay, Pinckney,⁹ McLean¹⁰ or the other great men who lead [*sic*] the Southern forces in that contest, and you will find that they deny the power of the Federal Government over the subject. They did not, at that day, pretend that Congress had the power to protect, but they only insisted that it had no power to prohibit. ("Hear, hear," and cheers.) This distinction, giving the power to protect and not to prohibit, is of later origin. (Laughter and cheers.) It required greater men, brighter intellects, more profound statesmen than Lowndes, Clay, Pinckney or McLean, or than Washington, Jefferson and Madison, who had preceded them, to make that refined distinction. (Laughter and cheers.)

Southern men stood together as an unit, denying the power of Congress over

⁸ As is well known, James Tallmadge of New York, supported by J. W. Taylor of the same state, took the initiative on February 13, 1819, in the House of Representatives in seeking to exclude slavery from Missouri. But Rufus King's speech in the Senate supporting this view was widely circulated as an Abolition campaign document. As early as 1785, in the Continental Congress, King sought to exclude slavery from the territories. See *Journals of the Continental Congress*, 34 vols. (Washington, 1904-1937), XXVIII, 164 (March 16, 1785); Charles R. King, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, 6 vols. (New York, 1894-1900), I, 39-40; VI, 217 ff.; Andrew C. McLaughlin, *The Confederation and the Constitution, 1783-1789* (New York, 1905), 117, 125; Frederick J. Turner, *The Rise of the New West, 1819-1829* (New York, 1906), 155-58. It is interesting to note how carefully Douglas ignored the antislavery provision in the Northwest Ordinance.

⁹ Douglas may have alluded to Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, who made a speech opposing the Missouri Compromise, but it is more likely that he had in mind William Pinkney, member of the Senate from Maryland, who "became the champion of the slaveholding states" in the controversy. J. Harold Easterby, "Charles Pinckney," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XIV, 613; John J. Dolan, "William Pinkney," *ibid.*, 628.

¹⁰ It is quite likely that Douglas alluded to Louis McLane of Delaware. Alney McLean of Kentucky did not participate in the debate on the Missouri question.

the subject of slavery. ("That's so.") The South demanded non-intervention, hands off, (cheers,) let the subject alone, let the people do as they please, so [long] as they do not violate the Constitution, and let the courts annul the territorial legislation when unconstitutional. (Tremendous applause.) That was the principle upon which the South stood in 1820, sustained by a few Northern men who had gallantry enough and devotion to principle sufficient to defy the fanaticism of their own section and to risk everything in the support of truth, justice and equality. ("Hurrah for Douglas," and cheers.) The fight was a fearful one, and brought this country to the very verge of dissolution. Unfortunately, in an evil hour, governed by patriotic motives, that overweighed a strict regard for fundamental principles, the South yielded the point and consented to a compromise. I blame no man who went for the Missouri Compromise. It was made by a band of as pure patriots as ever lived, and it had its origin in a love for the Union and a desire to live together in peace forever. In order to get Missouri into the Union, the South consented to the prohibition of slavery in all the Territory of the U. S. North of 36 deg. 30 min. That proposition did not suit the Northern abolitionists of that day any more than it has those who have followed them.

When I entered Congress, in 1843, I found the Missouri Compromise on the statute book, and the conservative men of all parties acquiescing in it. I could not reconcile it with sound principles, but still it was there. It had been received by the country as a peace offering; it had been acquiesced in for nearly twenty-five years; the North and the South stood by it as a unit; the Northern Whigs and Northern Democrats were supporting it, and nobody was fighting it but the Abolitionists. Such was the condition of things when the question of the annexation of Texas was introduced into Congress. I being one of its earliest and warmest advocates, proposed when the question of slavery arose in connection with it to disturb our harmony, to settle it by the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the Western border of Texas, in the same sense with which it was originally adopted. The South agreed to it, and a few men of the North went with me in its support. By these few votes, with a united South, we carried it and added Texas to the Union. (Cheers.)¹¹

In 1848, after we had acquired California and New Mexico, the question arose as to the kind of government we should give them.—Being Chairman of the Committee on Territories in the Senate, it became my duty to report the bill, which I did in August 1848, inserting in it, as the record will show, a provision extending the Missouri line to the Pacific Ocean, in the same sense and with the same understanding with which it was originally adopted in 1820. That proposition passed the Senate by twelve majority, receiving the support of every Southern man of every party, John C. Calhoun included. When it was sent down to

¹¹ Douglas seems to claim more than his share of credit. Cf. Justin H. Smith, *The Annexation of Texas* (New York, 1911), 327-28, 467.

the House of Representatives for concurrence, it was defeated by Northern votes with freesoil proclivities. [Laughter.] Its defeat produced all the sectional strife which existed from 1848 to 1850, and which again threatened the existence of the Union. If the Missouri line had been adhered to and extended to the Pacific Ocean, there would have been an end to the controversy forever, so far as the territories were concerned; but unfortunately the conservative men, the union-loving men of the country were unable to carry it out. The South planted itself upon the Missouri line as a *sine qua non*. The Nashville convention, which I think assembled in 1849 or '50, to prescribe the ultimatum on which the South would remain in the Union, tendered the Missouri line to the Pacific Ocean, as I had previously offered it as a settlement which would be satisfactory to the South. [Cheers.] Being unable to get that line so extended, the Abolitionists demanding that slavery should be prohibited everywhere, south as well as north of 36 deg. 30 min., the question then arose, "is there no other plan, is there no common ground upon which we can adjust this question upon the basis of equality and constitutional right." The strife which ensued alarmed the purest and best patriots in the land, for the fate of the Republic. Even the great Clay, who had performed his mission on earth, and retired to the shades of Ashland, to prepare for another and a better world, in his retirement heard the harsh and discordant notes of disunion and sectional strifes, and came forward from his retirement and resumed his seat in the Senate, that great theatre of his great deeds, to see if he could not by his wisdom, his experience, and the renown of his great name, do something to restore peace to a distracted country. [Hurrah for Clay" and cheers.) From the moment that Clay appeared among us, he became the leader of the Union Whigs and the Union Democrats, without regard to party distinction, against northern and southern agitators. For many months we assembled every morning in the Council Chamber, Clay in the Chair and Cass upon his right and Webster upon his left, devising means by which we could put down Northern abolitionism and Southern disunionism, and restore peace. The result of these deliberations was the Compromise Measures of 1850. We had been anxious to extend the Missouri line to the Pacific, but unable to do it. We had not the power, we could not get enough votes, and hence we had to devise a new plan. What was that new plan? It was that slavery was to be banished from the halls of Congress, and recommended to each State and each Territory to do as it pleased, and if any State or any Territory passed any law violating the rights of any citizen, he could appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, whose decision was to be final and conclusive. In other words, the Compromise Measures of 1850 were based on the great principle of non-intervention by Congress with the subject of slavery. Those measures brought the Federal Government back to the days of the Constitution, when there was peace and harmony in the country.

From this brief review you will see that the Constitution was made and the government organized on the principle of non-interference by Congress with

the question of slavery either in the States or in the Territories; that that principle was maintained in good faith down to 1820, when it was abandoned for the principle of intervention, which lasted until 1850, when it was abandoned and non intervention re-established according to the original doctrines of the Constitution. The intervention which prevailed from 1820 up to 1850 was the intervention of the Abolitionists against the South, but there was no intervention on the other side. [Cheers.] From 1850 down to this day the national men of all political parties have been pledged to non-intervention. When those measures were adopted there was an attempt made North and South to resist them. Recall to your minds for a moment the scenes which occurred immediately after they passed. When I went home that year, a cripple upon crutches from a surgical operation, I found the Northern people in a wild frenzy of fanaticism. Seward, Sumner, Chase, Giddings and the Abolition leaders were appealing to the Northern people and inflaming their passions upon the ground that by the compromise measures of 1850 we had betrayed Northern honor, Northern rights and Northern equality into the hands of the slave power. At Chicago, where I resided, the excitement was intense. Your chairman, in introducing me, referred to what occurred there. The city council passed resolutions officially denouncing me as a traitor, a Benedict Arnold, a Judas Iscariot, denounced the fugitive slave law as a violation of the Constitution and the law of God; instructed the police not to aid in executing it, and raised the standard of rebellion against federal authority. An Abolition meeting assembled for the purpose of carrying out these revolutionary proceedings, and they sent an invitation to me to come and address them. They first took possession of the hall and surrounded the stand with a body of free negroes and fugitive slaves armed with pistols and bowie knives, so that my friends could not gain admission, and then invited me to come. ["Hurrah for Douglas," and cheers.] I confess it was an entertainment which I did not care about participating in. [Laughter.] I went, not because I wanted to go, but because I thought it was most prudent to go. [Cheers.] I knew that if I did not go and meet the mob that it would come and find me. [Great laughter and cheers.] I was advised to leave the city, but I preferred any fate rather than do that. ["Good," and loud applause.] I went to their meeting, appeared on the stand and held them for four hours, surrounded by these colored gentlemen. [Laughter.] The first converts I made were the negroes, [loud laughter and applause,] and when I got possession of them I turned to the Abolitionists and said to them, I am now able to give you a practical illustration of your own doctrine, [cheers,] you raise a mob, and I take possession of it. [Cheers.] Luckily, the meeting listened to me while I vindicated *seriatem* [sic] every word and line in the fugitive slave law; demonstrated that it was their duty as honest men to support and execute it, and vindicated the compromise measures in full in all their parts. Before the meeting adjourned, resolutions were passed approving the fugitive slave law, [loud cheers,] and the next night the city council assembled in obedience to public opinion and re-

scinded their nullifying resolutions and declared that the law must be executed. [Cheers.] For weeks, each day, I addressed other meetings which were just as violent and just as fanatical.—Sometimes I would get them and sometimes they would get me. [A voice—"They didn't get you often," laughter and applause.] By a firm adherence to truth, to principle and to constitutional guaranties [*sic*] we brought the Northern people back to a sense of their duty, and for a time there was peace in the land.¹²

Now let me inquire what was being done in the South while we were fighting that battle in the North? In Mississippi you had Col. Davis on the stump denouncing the compromise measures as a surrender of Southern rights, Southern equality and Southern honor to Northern Abolitionists, and you had other leaders, extremists, in Alabama, Georgia and South Carolina, doing the same thing. But the Southern people could not be led off by appeals to their passions. In every Southern State the people resolved that they would maintain the principles on which the adjustment had been made. From that time your fire-eaters submitted to the doctrine of non-intervention, not because Congress had affirmed it, not because they liked it, but because the people of Alabama told them to submit, [tremendous applause,] and the people of each of the other Southern States told their politicians to submit. They then all became advocates of the doctrine of non-intervention. [Laughter.] The Northern Abolitionists being routed in one section and the Southern fire eaters in the other, they proposed a truce and treaty of peace. These Southern hotspurs became the most humble and polite gentlemen you ever saw. [Laughter and cheers.] They begged admission back into the Democratic party, [laughter,] and when we assembled at Baltimore in 1852 and nominated Gen. Pierce for President, we received them back on condition that they would abandon their opposition to non-intervention and thereafter vote with us in support of that principle. The National Democratic Convention in 1852, at Baltimore, affirmed the doctrine of non-intervention as it had been established by the compromise measures of 1850. No man will deny these facts.

Alabama voted for it in that convention and ratified the platform soon after, by voting for Pierce. ("That's so.") When the Whig party assembled in Convention in Baltimore in 1852, and nominated Gen. Scott for president, it affirmed the compromise measures of 1850, in substance and in principle is [*sic*] the language. That plank in the Whig platform was written by Daniel Webster at the table of Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, and was adopted by the Whig Convention at Baltimore.

¹² For the Chicago incident, cf. Brown, *Stephen Arnold Douglas*, 76-77; Milton, *The Eve of Conflict*, 81-82; James M. Sheahan, *The Life of Stephen A. Douglas* (New York, 1860), 168 *et seq.* This speech of October 23, 1850, was written out by Douglas next day and was printed in the appendix to [M. H. Flint], *Life of Stephen A. Douglas with His Most Important Speeches and Reports by a Member of the Western Bar* (New York, 1861). It was also issued as a pamphlet by Gideon of Washington in 1851.

Thus only eight years ago every Democrat and every Whig in the land stood pledged by the platform of his party, to carry out in good faith the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress with the question of slavery.

In 1854 it became my duty, still acting as the Chairman of the Committee on Territories, to report a bill to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. The old geographical line having been abandoned, and the doctrine of non-intervention substituted, which the Whigs and Democrats had both affirmed in the national Conventions, and which nobody opposed but the Abolitionists, I framed the bill on that principle. ("Good" and applause.) In order to give non-intervention and popular sovereignty fair play, and do equal and exact justice to the South as well as to the North, I incorporated¹³ into the bill a provision repealing the Missouri restriction. (Cheers.) I did this for the reason that we had not been able to carry out the Missouri compromise in good faith. I was unwilling, as a Northern man, to allow it to stand on the statute book where we would claim its advantages without submitting to its disadvantages. When our Northern people refused to sustain me in extending the Missouri line to the Pacific ocean, which good faith required us to do, I told them I would take it off the statute book and place the South on an equality with the North. (Cheers.) I assume all the responsibility that attaches to the blotting out of that black line across the continent. ("We will sustain you in it," and cheers.) Then it was that the Abolitionists howled. They, for the first time, discovered that the Missouri Compromise was a great covenant, [laughter,] a compact binding in honor which no honest man could disregard. The same men who thus characterized it as sacred, were the men who in 1848 had prevented our carrying it out in good faith; who had denounced me for being its advocate, and who had denounced the Missouri Compromise as being the most infamous measure on earth. The moment it was taken off the statute book they seized its repeal as another element of agitation. But when we repealed it, we inserted in the law itself our reasons for doing so. Look into the 14th section of the Nebraska Kansas bill, the section which contains the repealing clause, and there you will find it stated in so many words, that the Missouri line is repealed because it is [in]consistent with the doctrine of non-interference by

¹³ This statement is true but misleading. The idea was only *implicit* in the bill as reported by Douglas on January 4, 1854. Archibald Dixon of Kentucky on January 16 offered an amendment specifically repealing the Missouri Compromise. Douglas accepted this amendment. Cf. P. Orman Ray, "The Genesis of the Kansas-Nebraska Act," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1914, I (Washington, 1916), 259-80; *id.*, *The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise* (Cleveland, 1909); James F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the End of the Roosevelt Administration*, 9 vols. (New York, 1928), I, Chap. V; Milton, *The Eve of Conflict*, 109-14; Albert B. Hart, *Slavery and Abolition, 1831-1841* (New York, 1906), Chap. VII. French E. Chadwick, *Causes of the Civil War, 1859-1861* (New York, 1906), 58, says that in acting as he did, Douglas was "but yielding to an unconscious pressure which he could not resist. He 'rode the whirlwind' but did not 'direct the storm.' "

Congress with the question of slavery in the States and Territories. Every man who voted for that bill affirmed, under oath, that he was in favor of non-intervention in the future. Every Democrat, yes, every man of every party in Alabama who voted for that bill, affirmed non-intervention and swore to it. [Cheers.] Search the record; look at the votes of your Senators, and they declared, under oath, by their votes for the Nebraska bill, that the Missouri line was repealed because it was inconsistent with the doctrine of non-interference by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories, as affirmed in the Compromise measures of 1850. [Cheers.]

It is true that one or two Southern Senators came to me and wanted me to strike out those words—that reason for repealing the Missouri compromise. I asked them why they wanted these words stricken out. They replied that they desired to have them stricken out because they had voted against the compromise measures in 1850, and they did not now like to affirm them. [Laughter.] I said to the leading man with them, "Sir, I know you voted against the principle in 1850, but you took the back track afterwards and pledged yourselves to it in 1852. I hold you to that pledge." He answered that he was willing to stand by it, but he did not like to vote it. (Laughter.) I told him that I insisted he should vote it under oath. I left the words in, and made them all vote for the provision. ("Good," and cheers.) I thought that when they voted for the principle under oath I could trust them. [Laughter.] I not only made them, by their votes, for the Nebraska bill, pledge themselves to non-intervention in the future, but I made them also state the principle on which we were to act. I will quote the language of the clause which was inserted for the purpose of stating what principle we were acting on, and to prevent unscrupulous men from misrepresenting us. These are the words of the clause:

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." [Cheers.]

Here is the full length and breadth of popular sovereignty, or "squatter sovereignty," to which I ever went, or ever desired to go, ["Right," and cheers,] and for that every Southern Senator and Representative who voted for the Nebraska bill, and nearly every one of them did so vote—voted under oath.—The very men who now denounce me for advocating that doctrine, stood pledged to me and to the country that in the future they would help carry it out. ["They did," "True."] I have redeemed my pledge; I have stood faithful to the principle, and I am here to defend it to-day and to vindicate my own character, my own honor and my own consistency by the record. I assail no man, I impeach no man's motives, but I defy any man on earth to show that I have not strictly performed my pledge. [Cheers.]

When we assembled in Convention at Cincinnati, in June, 1856, for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President, and forming

a platform for the party, Alabama was represented. Her delegates did not come like most of the others, untrammelled and at liberty to do as they pleased; but they came [*sic*] like ambassadors, with their instructions in their hands—they came telling us that Alabama sent them to the Convention to vote for and pledge her support to the nominee, provided the National Democratic party affirmed the doctrine of non-intervention. [Cheers.] Illinois was represented there by as true a set of men as ever lived, with the gallant Richardson¹⁴ at their head. He told the Alabama delegation that the terms their State presented were right and just; that the principle of non-intervention was the principle of the Constitution itself, the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and that Illinois would stand by Alabama in demanding its recognition by the Convention. [Cheers.] The Democracy of Alabama entered into a solemn compact of honor at Cincinnati with the Democracy of each other State of the Union, that if they would adhere to non-intervention Alabama would.—We have adhered to it, and I now come to inquire whether Alabama is going to stand today by the terms on which she went to Cincinnati in 1856? ["We will;" "We hope so;" "We will in the end," and cheers.]

After the Convention adjourned at Charleston, and before it re-assembled at Baltimore¹⁵ in the present year, I made a speech in the Senate in reply to Jefferson Davis and others, in which I offered the Alabama platform of 1856 as a basis of compromise and reconciliation. I did not ask at Charleston or at Baltimore any other or different platform than that which Alabama had prescribed at Cincinnati—when Mr. Buchanan was nominated.—[Cheers.] James Buchanan and John C. Breckinridge were nominated and elected on the platform of non-intervention. They never could have been elected on any other platform. [Applause.] The Cincinnati platform was adopted by the unanimous vote of the delegates from every State in the Union.—There was not one vote against it from any one State. It declared in so many words that this Union could only be preserved on the basis of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States or in the Territories. [Cheers.] When the Democratic party assembled at Charleston this year to nominate a candidate for the Presidency, the Northern Democracy came forward and asked that the Cincinnati platform might be re-affirmed in the precise words in which it stood, and had been adopted by Alabama; [laughter; but we were met by the delegation from

¹⁴ The "gallant Richardson" was William A. Richardson, Douglas's chief lieutenant in the House, chairman of the House Committee on Territories, and unsuccessful opponent of Nathaniel P. Banks in the speakership contest of 1855-1856. See Fred H. Harrington, "'The First Northern Victory,'" in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), V (1939), 186-205. In 1863 Richardson was elected to a seat in the Senate.

¹⁵ On the Charleston, Richmond, and Baltimore conventions of 1860, cf. Emerson D. Fite, *The Presidential Campaign of 1860* (New York, 1911); Murat Halstead, *A History of the National Political Conventions of the Current Presidential Campaign* (Columbus, 1860); Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., "New York and the Election of 1860," in *New York History* (Albany, 1919-), XV (1934), 124-43.

your State, who told us that if we stood where Alabama stood four years ago, Alabama would bolt, [laughter and cheers,] telling us that the platform which Alabama adopted in 1856 was so rotten in 1860 that an honest man could not stand upon it. [Laughter and applause.] Is it true that Democratic principles become rotten so quick. ["No."] Men may get rotten, but principles are eternal. [Cheers.]

Why was there any secession from Charleston and Baltimore? The men who seceded tell the people that they were not willing to endorse Douglas and his squatter sovereignty notions. [Laughter and cheers.] I believe that is their excuse. ["That's it," "give it to them."] The record shows that excuse is not true. [Cheers.] I did not desire the Charleston or Baltimore Convention to endorse my opinions or any other person's opinions on popular sovereignty. [Cheers.] No friend of mine asked any new plank in the platform. No friend of mine desired one word or letter of the platform changed. We were for standing by the time-honored principles of the party, by the platform as it stood and had been ratified by the people in 1856, without the dotting of an i or the crossing of a t, and in favor of maintaining the organization of the party as a means of destroying Abolitionism and saving the country. [Cheers.] Hence it is not true that I or my friends, or any one of them, went to Charleston or Baltimore demanding that popular sovereignty, or "squatter sovereignty," should be endorsed. We went there in favor of the old platform and the old principles, willing to elect a man in 1860 upon the same principles upon which Buchanan and Breckinridge were elected in 1856. But here come some gentlemen from Alabama and others from Washington¹⁶ with instructions from federal authority [a voice—"from the 'old public functionary,'"] that they must insert a new plank into the platform which Douglas would not stand upon or break up the party. ["That's truth."] They were certain that if they maintained the old platform, the time-honored principles of the party, that Douglas would stand on it until doomsday, [cheers,] and they were equally certain—and I thank them for the compliment—that if they reversed the principles of the party, if they abandoned the doctrine of non-intervention and went over to the old federal doctrine of Congressional intervention, that I would never stand on it. [Cheers.] The record shows, beyond the power of any candid man to deny it, that they abandoned the party at Charleston and Baltimore because the party would not abandon its principles.—["True, true."] Those who staid in the Convention were in

¹⁶ Senator John Slidell of Louisiana went to Charleston, not as a delegate, but apparently as the agent of Buchanan to prevent the nomination of Douglas. Louis M. Sears, *John Slidell* (Durham, 1925), 163-64; Philip G. Auchampaugh, "The Buchanan-Douglas Feud," in *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (Springfield, 1908-), XXV (1933), 5-48. Dean Richmond, chairman of the New York delegation, aided in this, hoping that with Douglas out of the way, the convention would turn to Horatio Seymour. Cf. "New York and the Election of 1860," in *loc. cit.*, 124-43; [James Buchanan], *Mr. Buchanan's Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion* (New York, 1866), 78.

favor of the organization of the party, its old platform and its old principles, those who bolted went out because the party would not change its principles on the most vital point. [Cheers.]

What good reason was there for the demand of a change in the platform? It is not a valid argument against a man to prove only that he has changed. I trust that we all grow wiser as we grow older, and just as fast as we become convinced of our error we ought to be frank enough and honest enough to confess it. I have no objection to a man who having held to one doctrine changes it, provided he will confess that he has changed and give me the reasons which produced his conversion. (Laughter and cheers.) Now, it may be possible that the same reasons which produced this sudden conversion in the minds of so many men, and satisfied them that that which was right in 1856 was wrong in 1860, that non-intervention was constitutional at one time and unconstitutional at another. I say it may be that if they had given me the reasons which wrought this change in their minds, it might have changed mine too. (Laughter and applause.) But let us see whether there was any good reason for their change. They say that Southern rights, Southern honor and Southern equality were all violated and forfeited under the doctrine of non-intervention.—How is it done? Why, they say that non-intervention and popular sovereignty is only a short cut to abolitionism. It is funny to hear these Southern and Northern interventionists talk on this question. The Abolitionists of the North say that if you allow the people to decide the question they will be sure to adopt slavery everywhere in the Territories, and the Southern interventionists say that if you allow the people to decide it they will be sure to abolish and prohibit slavery everywhere in the Territories. (Laughter and applause.)—The Abolition agitators declare that unless Congress prohibits slavery, "squatter" sovereignty will carry it everywhere, and in order to prove that this view of the matter is correct, they point to New Mexico and say, "look there! There is a country five times as large as New York, in a comparatively Northern climate and elevated above the sea, which was all free when we acquired it in 1848, but in 1858 the people, by the authority of 'squatter' sovereignty and by no other authority whatever, passed laws introducing, protecting and maintaining slavery there." (Cheers.)—That is the abolition argument to prove that popular sovereignty and non-intervention is all wrong, and that if the doctrine prevails the North have no chance and the South have it all their own way.—(Laughter.) Come down to Alabama and here the secessionists tell you that non-intervention and popular sovereignty is a short cut to Abolitionism; that if you allow the people to decide the question for themselves they will be sure to prohibit slavery, and that the South have no chance at all.

A voice—What do you tell them?

Mr. Douglas—I tell them that the true Democratic doctrine, the true doctrine of the Constitution, the great fundamental principle of free government the world over, is that every people on earth shall be allowed to make their own

laws, establish their own institutions, manage their own affairs, take care of their own negroes and mind their own business.—[Cheers.] That is the true Democratic doctrine as affirmed in our platforms in 1848, 1852, 1856, and 1860.

It does not vitiate the correctness of the principles whether slavery under it does or does not exist, and I will tell you why. Under that principle slavery will exist wherever the people want it, and will not exist anywhere else.—According to my knowledge of human nature, the people will want it wherever the climate and soil render it necessary and profitable, but wherever the climate is such that slavery is neither necessary [n]or profitable, the people will not have it, and no power in Christendom can force it on them. [Cheers.] This question of slavery is one of political economy depending upon the laws of climate, production and self-interest. You cannot compel slavery to exist in a cold, Northern latitude any more than by an act of Congress you can make cotton grow upon the tops of the Rocky Mountains. [Laughter and cheers.] Whenever you make up your minds to maintain slavery in those cold Northern regions, where the people do not want it and will not have it, you must first get an act of Congress compelling cotton, rice, sugar and tobacco to grow there, and then you can have negroes.—[Laughter and applause.] The dividing line between free States and slave States, between white labor and slave labor, cannot be determined by degrees of latitude. It is dependent upon climate rather than latitude and longitude, and climate is affected by elevation above the sea as much as it is by the degrees of latitude Northward. Hence, in a mountain region, where the land lies so high above the sea that there is scarce any summer, where tropical products will not grow, and where only the white man can live in health and comfort, there you cannot have slavery. And why do you want it? I never know [*sic*] that it was desirable for a people to have a thing that was not good for them.—[Laughter and cheers.] My idea is that a people, if they are capable of self-government, should be permitted to decide for themselves what laws are good and what laws are bad; and you have no more right to force a good thing on an unwilling people than you have to force a bad thing on them. [Laughter and cheers.] They are the best judges of what institutions will suit them and what will not.

But the fire-eaters tell you that if you allow the people to do as they please, under the limitations of the Constitution that the Yankees will just swarm into the new Territories and out-vote the Southern men. Well, I have not as bad an opinion of the Yankee as some people have; but I have not so good an opinion of him as to believe that he will carry his anti-slavery sentiments with him wherever he goes. (Cheers.) My opinion of the Yankee is the same as my opinion of the Southern man, that whenever he goes into a new State or Territory he will vote according to the opinions which prevail in the country in which he lives, and not according to the notions he brought with him from Yankee land. For instance, suppose we should acquire the Island of Cuba, and I trust we will very soon, (cheers,) and after we acquired it, it should be colon-

ized by Sumner, Seward, Chase, Giddings, Lincoln and men of that class, nobody but Abolitionists going there, do you think they would free the negroes in Cuba? ("No," and laughter.) How long would it be before they would each have a plantation? They might make some few excuses, saying that it made a great difference whether the slaves had Christian masters or not, and whether they had kind, prudent men to take care of them. (Cheers and laughter.) Any man of brains who will go to Cuba and stay a week will find that that Island with slave labor to secure tropical productions, is the choicest country on the face of the earth; but if their negroes were set free, with no power over them to direct them, they would be a curse to any country. Why is Cuba now more desirable than San Domingo? The latter has ten acres of good land to Cuba's one. San Domingo in the production of tropical staples would be worth ten times as much as Cuba; but for the fact that the negroes there have been turned loose and have become a curse to the Island, whereas in Cuba they have been kept in subjection, and there civilization can flourish. If we should take San Domingo, and then let the white people govern it they would establish slavery by the first act of their Legislature. (Cheers.) But to return. You have got some Yankees in Alabama, I presume. ("Yes," and laughter.) Some of them are overseers, and I have heard that they were noted for being very rigid in their treatment of the slaves. ["That's so."] Some of them are planters, and I never heard that they had any conscientious scruples about holding slaves. So far as I know the Yankee who goes South is the worst fire-eater in christendom. ["True," and laughter, "Not all of them."] I will permit you to judge for yourselves on that point; but I do aver that the most relentless, bitter, cruel, persecuting Abolitionists in the whole Northern country, are the Southern men of Southern birth, who sold their negroes, moved into Illinois, bought land with the proceeds, got rich on the rise of property, and turned Republicans, in order to get office. [Cheers.] If there are any of them who are a little worse than the balance, it is a few from Alabama who[m] I remember now.¹⁷ [Laughter and cheers.] The fact is, take Southern men into a country where slavery is not profitable, and they will be opposed to it. Take Northern men into a country where slavery is necessary under the climate and profitable, and there they will protect it.

But what did the seceders at Charleston and Baltimore want?

They wanted a clause affirming the duty of Congress to protect slave property in the same manner as other property. I believe that is a fair statement: is it not? ["It is."] I would not misrepresent them for the world. I always like to state an opponent fairly, and then answer his objections. I repeat, then, that they desire that Congress shall protect slave property in the Territories just like all other property. I can pardon small politicians, who have no opinions but those they learn from their ambitious leaders, when they talk nonsense; ["Hit them again," and cheers;] but when statesmen, Senators, candidates for the

¹⁷ Doubtless an allusion to James G. Birney.

Presidency, assume to palm off a falsehood on the American people, by vague phrases, that convey an erroneous impression, I am amazed at the attempt. They want Congress to protect slavery the same as it does horses and cattle and merchandize in a Territory! Do they not know that Congress never yet protected horses or cattle or merchandize, or any other property, in an organized Territory? [Laughter and applause.]

When did Congress ever pass a law creating a criminal code for any organized Territory? Suppose you go to a Territory, and your horse is stolen, what act of Congress is violated? ("Let them have it," and great laughter and applause.) I defy these men who want slave property protected like other property, to show me a case where Congress ever passed a law for an organized Territory punishing murder, robbery, larceny, or any other crime whatever. All Congress does is to call into existence the Territorial Government, allow the people to elect their members of the Legislature, and then make their own criminal code, and protect their own property.—("Right," and applause.) Do you not suppose that Major Breckinridge and his co-workers know these facts? What excuse can be made for Senators and Representatives who attempt to deceive the American people by holding out the idea that Congress protects all other property in a Territory, and will not protect slave property. (Laughter and applause.)

I claim to know what I am talking about in speaking of our Territorial policy. A man sometimes has peculiar opportunities of knowing. I was Chairman of the Committee on Territories of the House, before I went to the Senate, and since I have been in the Senate, I served as Chairman of the same committee for eleven years in succession. During that period I drew up the bills which admitted Texas, Iowa, Wisconsin, California, Minnesota and Oregon into the Union. During that same period I wrote the bills to organize the Territories of Oregon, Minnesota, Washington, Utah, New Mexico, Kansas and Nebraska.—By this time I ought to know something about our Territorial policy and Territorial legislation, and I tell you that no man of ordinary intelligence and brains has any excuse for pretending that Congress ever protected horses, cattle, or other property in a Territory, any more than it protected negro slaves. [Cheers.]

These gentlemen forget that we are living under a Federal Government of limited powers. What provision of the Constitution gives Congress the right to legislate concerning my horses or my cattle, or my merchandize, or your negroes, outside of the Fugitive Slave Law? Persons and property, under our system of government, are dependent upon local law for protection, and not upon Congress.—[Cheers.] What right has Congress to interfere with your horses, your merchandize, your negroes, in Alabama? Why do you not demand that negroes in Alabama shall be protected by Congress, the same as other property? [Laughter.] Why, there is not a schoolboy twelve years old, but what knows that Congress has no business to interfere with either.

And yet, all this prejudice against me, for not being faithful to the principles of the Constitution, has been produced in the minds of the people by this miserable system of [mis]representation.

If you once grant what they all know to be true, that all property, and all persons, under our system, are under the local law for their protection, there is an end of all talk about Squatter Sovereignty. [Cheers.] These gentlemen say that they demand, and they are going to fight for the right to carry their negroes into the Territory, on the same terms that a Northern man carries his horses. Who ever denied the right? But they are going to fight on it. What is the use of fighting about it, if nobody ever disputed it. The only question is, on what terms does a Northern man carry his property into a Territory? I assert that all men, citizens of all the States, free and slave, may go into a Territory, and carry with them property of any description, in terms of exact equality, subject to the local law. [Cheers.] Horses, negroes, merchandize, every kind of property, goes subject to the local law. Why do not these gentlemen tell you so? If they did, they could not make any capital by misrepresentation. It would end their charge that we will not deal by your property as we deal by our own.

But they tell us that if slave property goes into a Territory, subject to the local law, perhaps it will not be protected—that it may be kept out by non-action or unfriendly legislation. Certainly it may, and so may other kinds of property. If a Northern man, or a Southern man either, who is dealing in groceries, determines to move to Kansas, he had better inquire, before he takes his brandies and whiskies with him, whether the Maine liquor law is in force there, [Laughter,] for if it should happen to be, he might consider it such unfriendly legislation as would interfere with his right to sell. [Laughter.] Every legislative body on earth is in the habit of discriminating, by friendly or unfriendly legislation, between different kinds of property. I suppose no man will dispute that. I presume that it is the case in Alabama. I do not know, but I take it for granted that you exempt church property, libraries, mechanics' tools, and a great variety of favored articles. I suppose that is the practice here; I know it is in most of the States. You favor it because you think that you ought to encourage certain occupations and pursuits for the good of the society; and on the other hand, you put high duties on certain things which you wish to discourage. You will find a good example in point in Kansas Territory.

Some time ago they discovered in that Territory, that a great many men were engaged in buying Mustang ponies, down in Texas and Mexico, and driving them up through Kansas into Illinois, for sale, where they brought about twelve dollars a-piece. These dealers were in the habit of turning their ponies out on the plains of Kansas, to let them fatten, before presenting them for sale; and, inasmuch as in a new Territory the people are not all rail-splitters, and have not time to fence in any land except that which they cultivate, the inhabitants of Kansas, who were obliged to let their cattle run loose, found that the ming-

ling of the Mustangs with their stock was a great public injury. What did they do? They put a tax of ten dollars a head on every Mustang brought into the Territory, and released all blooded stock from taxation. There you have an example of friendly and unfriendly legislation. I do not know whether that is Constitutional or not; but all I have got to say, is, that if the law is Constitutional, the people of Kansas have a right to it. If it is not Constitutional, the Court will so decide, and then it becomes void.

But I deny that Congress can determine the question, whether the law is Constitutional or not. If any man feels aggrieved under that law, let him bring his case in the Territorial Courts, and appeal it to the Supreme Court of the United States. When that Court pronounces its judgment, every good man must abide the result. So it is with the negro question. Two years ago New Mexico passed a law introducing and maintaining slavery in that Territory. By what authority? Simply by that authority which my enemies call "Squatter Sovereignty." [Cheers.] But, about the same time, the Legislature of Kansas passed a law prohibiting slavery in that Territory. Now, the Black Republicans want Congress to repeal the slave code of New Mexico, and the fire-eaters want Congress to repeal the law prohibiting slavery in Kansas. I tell them "Never." It shall not repeal either, if I can prevent it. [Cheers.]

If the people of New Mexico want slavery, let them have it. It is their business—not ours. If the act is unconstitutional, make a case, and take it to the courts, and get their decision, and there is an end of it. If the fire-eaters want to repeal the legislation of Kansas against slavery, I tell them it is not to be done, if the prohibition is Constitutional. The people of Kansas had a right to pass it, if it is Constitutional; and if you doubt its Constitutionality, take it before the courts and get a decision, which is final, and there is an end of the controversy. There can be no excuse, no pretext, for bringing it back into Congress. Then why do these secessionists desire Congress to interfere with this question?—But they say they do not ask Congress to interfere, only when necessary. When is it necessary, in their estimation, for Congress to interfere and protect slavery? Not where the people want it, as in New Mexico; for wherever the people want it they will pass laws themselves to protect it. Hence, these Breckinridge men want Congress to interfere and maintain slavery wherever the people do not want it, and will not have it.

On the other hand the Black Republicans North tell us that they do not care about Congress prohibiting slavery where the people are opposed to it; for wherever the people do not want it they will prohibit it themselves, as they did in Kansas. They only want Congress to interfere and prohibit it where the people want to have it. Thus you find the Black Republicans in favor of having Congress prohibit slavery wherever the people want to have it, and the Breckinridge secessionists demand that Congress shall maintain and protect slavery wherever the people do not want it. They agree in principle. In fact, they are

only two different factions of the same party. [Tremendous applause and laughter.]

In the first place, the Breckinridge men and the Lincoln men agree that this slavery question shall be kept in Congress forever. They agree, in the next place, that Congress, and not the people, shall decide it. They agree, in the third place, that whenever Congress does decide it, they must determine it against the wishes of the people interested in it.—They agree, in the fourth place, in ridiculing, denouncing, and scouting non intervention and popular sovereignty. Agreeing thus far, they only differ as to which way Congress shall decide it. The Black Republicans want the decision in favor of the North and against the South, in all cases whatsoever, and the secessionists desire to have it against the North and in favor of the South. Each appeals to the passions and prejudices of their own section, against the peace and harmony of the whole country.

Now let me ask you, Southern men, what you are to gain by keeping this question in Congress? ["Nothing."] If you continue to do it, and the agitation goes on, you cannot fail to see the end. All Northern men will rally under one banner, and all Southern men will rally under an opposite banner; and thus two great hostile parties will be formed, with an "irreconcilable conflict" between them. Those of us who will join not either faction, are to be crushed out. Your Lincolns and Seward's will take the places of National men in the North; and the Union men in the South will fast disappear. Your Fire-Eaters, Secessionists, and Disunionists are to take the places of conservative men; and thus this country is to be the scene of a perpetual conflict between hostile sections. What will this country gain by such agitation? ["Nothing."]

I put the question to the Abolitionists of the North, what good they have done to the negro? What one slave have they emancipated? What one foot of American soil have they driven slavery from? and then I ask them whether have they not forced the master to draw the cord tighter, and to observe a degree of rigor in the treatment of their slaves which their own feelings would like to ameliorate, if the Abolitionists would permit them to live in safety, under a milder rule. ["True" and applause.] If the agitation has been a curse to the negro, without one redeeming feature, let us see what good it has done the white man. What good will it do you of the South, if you precipitate a sectional conflict, and divide parties by a geographical line. Is it assuming too much, when we undertake to say that the stronger will outvote the weaker. I belong to the stronger section, and I would deem myself a traitor to my country if I should exercise the power merely because we have got it.

But if you force this question into Congress; if you break up the Democratic party, unless you can keep it there, you may get Abolitionists in the place of every National man from the North, and then what kind of protection will you get for your slave property from an Abolition Congress? I will tell you what kind of protection you will get. That protection which a grizzly bear gives a child. You will find it will be squeezed to death in the gentle embrace. You

will get that kind of protection which a wolf gives a lamb. Protection to slave property by an Abolition Congress! And the same men who tell you that they are going to keep the question in Congress, and that they are determined to be protected by Congress, at the same time tell you that Northern men are so faithless that they will not even perform their Constitutional obligations.

Do you think there is a solitary fire-eater in all America who believes that his party can procure an act of Congress protecting slavery, and enforcing its existence, where the people do not want it? I do not think there is one of them who would risk his character by pretending that he did. Then why do they make the demand? Do they make it just for the purpose of having it rejected? Does it elevate the character of the Southern people to make a demand, and threaten to dissolve the Union if they do not get it, when they do not get it, when they do not intend to fight on it if they are refused? What is the inference? The only inference I can draw is, that these men desire a pretext for breaking up this Union. In order to get that pretext, they are going to make a demand that Congress shall pass a law which they know will never be passed. They are going to inflame Southern passion, and make such a law the condition upon which they will remain in the Union; and when it is refused, they will ask you to break up the Union because of that refusal.

I appeal to you to know whether you have any interest in this question of allowing Congress to take charge of your slaves. Whenever you recognize the power of Congress over slave property, your rights are gone.

What kind of protection do they want? Why, they say that Douglas, in one of his speeches in Illinois—perhaps at Freeport—declared that non-action by a Territorial Legislature was equivalent to the exclusion of slavery. I do tell them so; and some of their members of Congress had told them so before I made the speech. Howell Cobb, of Georgia, told the people of Pennsylvania the same thing, at Westchester, in September, 1856; and Old Buck made him Secretary of the Treasury because he did. James L. Orr, of South Carolina, who was lately speaker of the House of Representatives, made a speech in 1856 to the same effect. Southern men generally uttered the same great truth. You know that if you had no laws in Alabama to make negro-stealing a crime, no police regulations, no patrol system, no officers to prevent men from trading with your negroes at night, and selling them liquor—if you had no such laws, or police of any kind, your slave property would not be worth a farthing. Non-action is practical exclusion.

The fire-eaters say that if the Legislature does not enact laws for its protection, then Congress must. Well, let us illustrate this interference of Congress. Congress takes up one section of your slave code, which provides that if a man does not feed his negro properly he shall be indicted. I suppose that is a law in this State. I reckon it is. Mr. Seward moves to amend, that if he does not feed them with so many pounds of fresh beef, so many pounds of corn beef, so many chickens, so much venison and other fine food, he shall be indicted. [Laughter.]

There is then another section read, which provides that any man who does not clothe his negro properly shall be indicted, and Mr. Seward amends this by specifying what kind of clothing they shall furnish. He then demands that the ten hour system shall prevail among the slaves, as it does in the Eastern factories, and that no slave shall be forced to work before seven o'clock in the morning, and after five in the afternoon. Let Mr. Seward go on in this way, and get up a protective law for your property, and what is your property worth? Whenever you permit Congress to touch your slave property you have lost its value.

I hold that man to be your worst enemy who will go for Congressional intervention at all. Then my friends why is this agitation kept up? All experience proves, that so long as Congress does not touch the question there will be peace, and whenever Congress does interfere there is strife. Then why not banish it from the halls of Congress? The Democratic party now stands where it stood in 1848, under Cass, in 1852, under Pierce, in 1856, under Buchanan and Breckinridge, and in 1860, at Charleston, proclaiming Non-interference by Congress with the subject of slavery everywhere. If the people want it, they will pass laws to protect it; if they do not want it, no power on earth can force it on them. The only question then is, whether the people will want it or not. The people will want it wherever the climate renders slavery necessary and desirable, and they will not want it where the climate renders slavery unprofitable and undesirable. It is a question of climate, to be determined by soil and productions, and self-interest, and not a question of legislation. Show me a country where rice, cotton, and sugar are the principal staples, and I will show you a country where slavery would exist if there was no man but an Abolitionist living in it. [Laughter and cheers.]

These fire-eaters tell you that the people of the North are more numerous than the people of the South, and, therefore, if you allow the people to settle this question, the Yankees will outvote you. Do you think the Yankee would vote irrespective of his interest? ["No, he is not a fool," and laughter.] Suppose a Yankee goes South, where the white man cannot work and the negro is in his element. That Yankee never becomes a slaveholder, does he? ["Well he does," and laughter.] Go into Mississippi, or elsewhere, and show me a Yankee who went there, became an overseer, and when the owner of the plantation died, married the widow, and I will show you a fire-eater of the purest stripe. [Shouts of laughter and applause.] A Yankee, when he goes South, naturally thinks that he ought to get as much work out of a negro as is required from white hands up in his native North. He finds that the negro cannot labor so hard in this climate, and while forcing him to do quite as much, he thinks he is the most humane man living, because he does not get more work out of him than he could get out of a white man North!

Suppose we should acquire the Island of Cuba, and a pestilence should sweep off every human being from it, and then it should be colonized by Seward and Giddings, with their Emigrant Aid Societies, no man being permitted to go

there who was not an Abolitionists [*sic*], how long would they be in Cuba before they would establish slavery? How long before they would open the African slave trade? It does not matter where a man comes from when he settles in a country, he will advocate that line of policy and legislation which he thinks the good of the community in which he lives, his own interests, and those of his children require. A wise statesman will always adapt his laws to the wants and condition and circumstances of the people to be affected by them.

I believe there is a conspiracy on foot to break up this Union. It is the duty of every good citizen to frustrate the scheme. If Lincoln is elected, he owes it to the Breckinridge men, and then they tell us, after having tried to secure that result by dividing the party, that if he is elected they are going to dissolve the Union. At Norfolk, Va., they wanted to know whether, if Lincoln was elected. I would help them dissolve the Union. I told them never on earth. [Cheers.]

There is no living man who would do more to defeat Lincoln than myself. There is no man more anxious to defeat him than myself. And I would have no trouble in beating him to death, but for the support given him by the Breckinridge men. If Lincoln is elected, he must be inaugurated. And after he is inaugurated, if he attempts to violate any man's rights, or the Constitution of the country, we will punish him according to the Constitution, to the extent of the law. Notwithstanding the combination between the Breckinridge men and the Black Republicans at the North, we have already succeeded in ensuring the election of enough Douglas Democrats, united with the South, to outvote the Black Republicans. We shall hold both Houses of Congress against him during his term, if he should be elected.

I hold that the election of any man on earth by the American people, according to the Constitution, is no justification for breaking up this government. The Constitution has provided a means for punishing traitors, and it applies to men high in office as well as out of office. I will go for punishing an overt act, but not for breaking up the government.—[Cheers.] In conclusion, I desire to say that I regret the necessity that I have had for using a harsh word. Hunted down by a body of slanderers against my character, I felt bound to repel their charge with the indignation which it deserved. ["You are right," "Good," and cheers.]

Let the Union men of this country rally, let all the friends of Constitutional principles, of Constitutional government, all the enemies of sectional strife and agitation, rally around the principle of non-intervention, and we will crush out Northern abolitionism and Southern disunion. [Cheers.]

My friends there is a limit to every man's exertions.¹⁸ ["Go on," "Go on."] I would be glad to address you until sunset, but I have other duties to perform, and I owe an apology to these ladies whom I have kept here so long in an

¹⁸ It has been stated that Douglas took four hours to deliver this address. Yancey's reply, that evening, "was not, lighted with Yancey's familiar genius." DuBose, *Yancey*, 535.

uncomfortable position, they being obliged to remain by the crowd. I do not know how to express to you the gratitude I feel for the patience and kindness with which you have listened to me. It is due to those who differ with me in opinion—and I take it for granted there are some, perhaps many in this large crowd of that class—to say, that while they may take a course which I deeply lament as destructive of our government, they know when they go to a public meeting how to conduct themselves as gentlemen. They have certainly done so on this occasion.—While I always express my opinions with entire freedom, and without the slightest reservation or concealment, it is never my purpose to wound the sensibilities of any one, much less to say that which shall give just cause of offence. I always speak freely, boldly and unequivocally when I speak at all, but I recognize those courtesies and proprieties of life which a gentleman never forgets. I thank you all.

He retired amidst tremendous applause by the assembled multitude.¹⁹

¹⁹ Douglas went that night by boat to Selma, and after speaking there, went on to Mobile, where, the evening before the election, "a large crowd cheered his plea that Alabama had more security within than without the Union." Next day he heard the news of the election in the office of his friend, John Forsyth, editor of the unionist Mobile *Register*. Milton, *The Eve of Conflict*, 500.

Book Reviews

The Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861. By Avery Craven. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1939. Pp. xii, 97. \$1.50.)

This delightful little book consists of the second series of the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History which Professor Craven delivered at Louisiana State University in February, 1938. His general theme is that the Civil War was not inevitable but for the foolishness of men who let their emotions run away with their reason. If this conclusion is not entirely novel, the argument is presented in a manner both refreshing and stimulating.

Although the South, like other great sections, contained elements of unity, its interests and social attitudes were so diverse that its people never thought seriously of separate nationality until fused into something like unity by pressure from without. This pressure began with the abolitionist crusade which forced the Southerners into a defense not merely of slavery but, finally, of the whole economic and social structure of their section. The abolitionists never bothered to find out what slavery in the South was actually like: they began with the assumption that it was wholly evil and the slaveholders depraved and launched into a perfect ecstasy of vilification. The incensed Southerners replied in kind. As the campaign of exaggerated accusation progressed, sectional economic and political rivalries became linked with the contest over slavery and added more clamor to the din of mutual recrimination. Thus the leaders of the industrial groups of the Northeast, who had been contending with the agriculturists of the South and West since the days of Hamilton and Jefferson, saw in the slavery issue an opportunity to split the agrarians, whose ablest leaders were Southern planters, by arousing the West against the South. They therefore aided the "holy war" against the Southern "aristocracy," less because they disliked slavery than because they wished to break the political power of their opponents. By the time the North was sufficiently united on this program to elect Lincoln in 1860, the campaign of hate had gone so far that reconciliation was impossible. "God's purposes" must be fulfilled by a bloody war.

The three lectures, "Foundations of Southern Nationalism," "The Peculiar Institution," and "The Repressible Conflict," are well articulated and, although there is necessarily some repetition, they flow along in logical sequence. While the chief interest of the special student will be in the interpretation, the general

reader who has derived his knowledge of the period from textbooks and the older "standard" histories will find the evidence a revelation and will relish the delightfully easy and informal style. Teachers who have struggled with the intricacies of the subject will be grateful for Craven's gift for luminous exposition, for his ability to reveal in simple terms the essence of things which many have sensed but found hard to make clear to their students. For instance, his analysis of "the peculiar institution" is an excellent example of how informed common sense may be applied to historical interpretation. The reader feels that the situation described was a perfectly natural one for its time. Such art is possible only when a discerning mind is sustained by ripe scholarship.

The little book is beautifully printed and is a credit to the Louisiana State University Press. Because it is published primarily to make the lectures available to those who were not privileged to hear them, the usual footnotes and index have been omitted.

The University of Texas

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL

The Biography of a River Town: Memphis, Its Heroic Age. By Gerald M. Capers, Jr. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xiv, 292. Bibliography, illustrations, tables, maps, and charts. \$3.50.)

This is a refreshing and enlightening history of a city. Books of this type are too often of two classes; first, those hack jobs which proceed from mayor to mayor in deadly monotony, and second, the literary effusions which run entirely to "color" and patriotism. Mr. Gerald Capers of Yale University could not be dull even on assignment, and he is too good an historian to be misled by a chamber of commerce. His history of Memphis is as excellent a job as one would expect.

Mr. Capers has taken great pains to tie in his story of Memphis with the city's hinterland, with the great variety of regional factors, and with national crosscurrents. This is as it should be. Memphis did not grow up in a vacuum and could not be understood in one. In this phase of the book the most important contribution is a well-reasoned analysis which demonstrates beyond quibble that Memphis and all the Mississippi River cities belong to the West, whether they are located north or south. One is certainly led into an impenetrable fog in any attempt to unravel the story of a river town with no better thread to follow than Southernism; on this point the reviewer speaks from painful experience in dealing with the past of New Orleans.

The history of Memphis is divided by the author into several fairly well-defined periods. There is first an Indian phase, then a frontier phase, in which the community was dominated by flatboatmen, then a period of growth following the victory of law and order (more or less) over the flatboatmen, followed in

turn pretty closely by the Civil War, Reconstruction, and finally, after 1880, the emergence of the modern city. This division makes sense. In each of these periods or phases the development of the community is treated as a whole, and the details of mayoral elections are most happily omitted. One is grateful also to miss slavish adherence to a rigid chronology. The result is that a picture of community growth, and a feeling of understanding what that growth means, emerge with very gratifying clarity.

The book has another virtue in that it supplies its own color. The history of Memphis needs no special emphasis with a heavy brush. Mr. Capers has wisely chosen to let his Indians, flatboatmen, Negroes, local heroes, and yellow fever mosquitoes parade without adornment. To decorate these characters with fancy writing would be something of a record in gilding the lily.

Memphis today is much like any other American city, but in its heroic age, says Mr. Capers, it had a quality all its own. Perhaps quality is an ill-chosen word, tending to be misleading. This special character, not wholly agreeable, derived from an extraordinary blending of frontier, slavery, aliens, rugged individualism, yellow fever, war, cotton, and more cotton, and more cotton. The town was boisterous; life was raw and cheap, but one must perforce accept Mr. Capers' adjectives "protean and virile."

The weaknesses of Mr. Capers' book are corollary to its virtues. In his effort to tie up the story of Memphis with regional and national affairs he has been led inevitably into many generalizations, some of which are not easy to accept. Specifically, he explains the postwar cotton planter's credit system as something new (p. 220), whereas it was almost as old as cotton planting. In the same connection one finds a glib reference to the breakup of the large plantations; the reviewer believes it can be shown that concentration of land ownership intensified after the Civil War. More examples could be cited.

In similar fashion, the abandonment of strict chronology and the cavalier disregard of mayors produce defects as well as advantages. There is sometimes a little confusion and overlapping; a previously unmentioned mayor is sometimes casually referred to without adequate identification. As a matter of fact, other characters suffer from this disrespect on occasion, and are introduced by their bare surnames.

Finally, in treating whole periods of the city's history as units there is a certain repetitiousness which tends to mar the effect. The victory of respectable citizens over the flatboatmen is a case in point; it appears in a half dozen places.

All these matters are as nothing, however, when measured against the success of the whole book. Mr. Capers has set a high mark for scholars to shoot at.

From Mill Wheel to Plowshare: The Story of the Contribution of the Christian Orndorff Family to the Social and Industrial History of the United States. By Julia Angeline Drake and James Ridgely Orndorff. (Cedar Rapids: The Torch Press, 1938. Pp. xii, 271. Illustrations, appendix. \$3.00.)

This chronicle, historical and genealogical, covers the annals of the Christian Orndorff family in America. Commencing with the initial emigration from the German Palatinate to Pennsylvania in 1741, it portrays in panorama their successive settlements and westward migrations down to a recent period. Intelligent, hardheaded, thrifty, and warmhearted, the Orndorffs made their way surely in the New World, devoting their economic efforts mainly to grain milling and farming. As good churchmen of the Protestant faith and as good citizens, they played their part in the several communities which they founded and developed. The first Christian settled in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and his son, Major Christian, near Hagerstown, Maryland. The Major and his family, imbued with a love of freedom, participated actively in the preliminaries of the American Revolution. After hostilities began, they sent a constant stream of wagons loaded with flour to Baltimore and the vicinity to feed the soldiers fighting the British, while simultaneously giving valuable military aid to the Colonial army. The descendants of Major Orndorff principally moved to western Virginia shortly before 1800, and a few years later to the Red River Valley of Kentucky. Members of the Kentucky group settled in Central Illinois as early as 1827, and their milling and farming activities were subsequently transferred to their new homes. The Illinois group later adopted the spelling Orendorff. In Kentucky their interests were extended to include the operation of sawmills, woolen factories, and tanneries. Captain John, of the Red River, displayed a noteworthy inventive ability, his ideas embracing improvement of various types of milling machinery, a cotton press, and a diving bell. In 1852 William J. Orendorff of Illinois became the partner of William Parlin, who had established at Canton, a decade earlier, one of the first factories for making steel plows. Parlin & Orendorff built up a large and extensive business which remained in existence until 1919 when it was purchased by the International Harvester Company.

The subtitle of the volume, and references to family accounts, diaries, and letters consulted, would lead the reader to expect an adequate discussion of the social life of the family at various times and places, and also a full account of the grain milling industry with which they were so closely concerned for nearly two hundred years. Unfortunately both of these subjects, particularly the latter, have been largely neglected, thereby considerably lessening the value of the treatise. The early portion of the story is fragmentary in character, and the book as a whole poorly organized. The format and printing are good, and the text well illustrated. The story is supplemented with an appendix, containing documentary material pertaining to members of the Orndorff family, a list of the collateral descendants of Major Christian Orndorff and his wife, Elizabeth

Hoffman, footnotes, and a brief index. The footnotes would be more usable if they were placed at the bottom of each page rather than at the end of the volume.

In spite of the limitations of *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare*, the underlying feeling of deep attachment to the members of the Orndorff family, and the appreciation of their qualities, including character, which the authors display throughout the book, carry the reader along from page to page with increasing interest. This feeling and understanding ring true, notwithstanding the lack of critical appraisal of individuals, and do much to leave the final impression that here is a record, partial though it may be, of a sturdy and practical pioneer family, who have played their part honorably and well in the making of America.

McCormick Historical Association

HERBERT A. KELLAR

The Bonapartes in America. By Clarence Edward Macartney and Gordon Dorrance. (Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, 1939. Pp. 286. Bibliography, illustrations, chart. \$3.00.)

By using the above title, authors Macartney and Dorrance hoped to bind together into a sort of unity many diverse though interesting facts relating to the Bonapartes, to their descendants, and to some of Napoleon's soldiers. The ostensible touchstone is their relationship in some way to America. The well-known story of Jerome Bonaparte and Elizabeth Patterson is retailed at considerable length and this family line is brought on down to extinction with the passing of Charles J. Bonaparte, Theodore Roosevelt's attorney general. The other parts most logically making up the unity of this book are the accounts of Joseph Bonaparte's residence in New Jersey for nineteen years and of the exile of Louis Napoleon, later Napoleon III, in New York for a year.

Beyond this point the line of procedure becomes quite attenuated and strained, and in fact before this point has been reached it is evident that the authors have loaded their subjects with more than their title will bear, for much space is used in presenting the various characters apart from their relationship to America. There is practically no excuse for the chapter on Napoleon III and the Mexican crisis and even less for the short chapter on the Louisiana purchase. It is some embellishment to the Bonapartes to bring into the picture the French soldiers who emigrated to America, such as those attempting to form settlements in Alabama and in Texas and the Murats in Florida; and there is some logic in going into the Marshal Ney legend again, but the authors add nothing to what is already known and do not indeed summarize well the established facts concerning this intriguing speculation. Napoleon's illegitimate children are awarded a chapter because one is supposed to have lived in San Francisco, and the various plots to rescue Napoleon receive a chapter, in which the New Orleans activities are mentioned, resulting in the building of a boat and the construction of a house for his residence, which still stands.

Though this book is presented as adding much to previously known facts on the Bonapartes, there is little in it that has not already been written in various secondary works; and there is practically no evidence of any discovery or use of hitherto unused documents. There are few footnotes to important statements or quoted matter. The bibliography is inadequately presented in each item and it is in its whole make-up almost entirely secondary material, unless there is virtue in such a bibliographical item as "American and Foreign Journals and Newspapers of the day." The book has the saving grace of being interesting reading.

University of Georgia

E. MERTON COULTER

A French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837. By John Charles Dawson. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1939. Pp. 59. Bibliography.)

This brief monograph sketches the life of Joseph Lakanal who played a minor role in France, 1792-1815, sojourned in the United States during the Restoration, and later returned to his native country. The title, however, is somewhat misleading, as one half of this study deals with his French career and only fourteen pages are devoted to his life in Alabama.

Lakanal, apostate priest and regicide, was a member of the National Convention and was conspicuous in the subsequent establishment of the French Normal School. Somewhat lukewarm toward Napoleon, still he held office under him. Fleeing to the United States in early 1816, Lakanal spent six restless years in Kentucky, engaged in various activities: traveling, corresponding with Napoleonic conspirators, and giving assistance to the ephemeral Vine and Olive Company at Demopolis, Alabama, of which he was a stockholder, though never a resident of that colony. From May, 1822, to July, 1823, he was president of the College of Orleans in New Orleans, and from then (1823) until his return to France in 1837, he tried to play the role of a slaveholding planter near Mobile. Unfitted for the frontier life of a planter, disappointed, perhaps, at his failure to secure the presidency of the newly founded University of Alabama (1831), and disillusioned in general, Lakanal returned to his native land in 1837, a few years after receiving notification of his re-election to membership in the restored Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. He died in 1845.

Washington and Lee University

W. G. BEAN

Segments of Southern Thought. By Edd Winfield Parks. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1938. Pp. ix, 392. \$3.00.)

The author who collects his scattered essays and publishes them in volume form subjects himself to a doubly rigid criticism, for the question immediately arises as to the need or desirability of reprinting what has already been given to the public. Such a miscellany is justified if the essays are too valuable to remain

Though this book is presented as adding much to previously known facts on the Bonapartes, there is little in it that has not already been written in various secondary works; and there is practically no evidence of any discovery or use of hitherto unused documents. There are few footnotes to important statements or quoted matter. The bibliography is inadequately presented in each item and it is in its whole make-up almost entirely secondary material, unless there is virtue in such a bibliographical item as "American and Foreign Journals and Newspapers of the day." The book has the saving grace of being interesting reading.

University of Georgia

E. MERTON COULTER

A French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837. By John Charles Dawson. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1939. Pp. 59. Bibliography.)

This brief monograph sketches the life of Joseph Lakanal who played a minor role in France, 1792-1815, sojourned in the United States during the Restoration, and later returned to his native country. The title, however, is somewhat misleading, as one half of this study deals with his French career and only fourteen pages are devoted to his life in Alabama.

Lakanal, apostate priest and regicide, was a member of the National Convention and was conspicuous in the subsequent establishment of the French Normal School. Somewhat lukewarm toward Napoleon, still he held office under him. Fleeing to the United States in early 1816, Lakanal spent six restless years in Kentucky, engaged in various activities: traveling, corresponding with Napoleonic conspirators, and giving assistance to the ephemeral Vine and Olive Company at Demopolis, Alabama, of which he was a stockholder, though never a resident of that colony. From May, 1822, to July, 1823, he was president of the College of Orleans in New Orleans, and from then (1823) until his return to France in 1837, he tried to play the role of a slaveholding planter near Mobile. Unfitted for the frontier life of a planter, disappointed, perhaps, at his failure to secure the presidency of the newly founded University of Alabama (1831), and disillusioned in general, Lakanal returned to his native land in 1837, a few years after receiving notification of his re-election to membership in the restored Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. He died in 1845.

Washington and Lee University

W. G. BEAN

Segments of Southern Thought. By Edd Winfield Parks. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1938. Pp. ix, 392. \$3.00.)

The author who collects his scattered essays and publishes them in volume form subjects himself to a doubly rigid criticism, for the question immediately arises as to the need or desirability of reprinting what has already been given to the public. Such a miscellany is justified if the essays are too valuable to remain

Though this book is presented as adding much to previously known facts on the Bonapartes, there is little in it that has not already been written in various secondary works; and there is practically no evidence of any discovery or use of hitherto unused documents. There are few footnotes to important statements or quoted matter. The bibliography is inadequately presented in each item and it is in its whole make-up almost entirely secondary material, unless there is virtue in such a bibliographical item as "American and Foreign Journals and Newspapers of the day." The book has the saving grace of being interesting reading.

University of Georgia

E. MERTON COULTER

A French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837. By John Charles Dawson. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1939. Pp. 59. Bibliography.)

This brief monograph sketches the life of Joseph Lakanal who played a minor role in France, 1792-1815, sojourned in the United States during the Restoration, and later returned to his native country. The title, however, is somewhat misleading, as one half of this study deals with his French career and only fourteen pages are devoted to his life in Alabama.

Lakanal, apostate priest and regicide, was a member of the National Convention and was conspicuous in the subsequent establishment of the French Normal School. Somewhat lukewarm toward Napoleon, still he held office under him. Fleeing to the United States in early 1816, Lakanal spent six restless years in Kentucky, engaged in various activities: traveling, corresponding with Napoleonic conspirators, and giving assistance to the ephemeral Vine and Olive Company at Demopolis, Alabama, of which he was a stockholder, though never a resident of that colony. From May, 1822, to July, 1823, he was president of the College of Orleans in New Orleans, and from then (1823) until his return to France in 1837, he tried to play the role of a slaveholding planter near Mobile. Unfitted for the frontier life of a planter, disappointed, perhaps, at his failure to secure the presidency of the newly founded University of Alabama (1831), and disillusioned in general, Lakanal returned to his native land in 1837, a few years after receiving notification of his re-election to membership in the restored Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. He died in 1845.

Washington and Lee University

W. G. BEAN

Segments of Southern Thought. By Edd Winfield Parks. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1938. Pp. ix, 392. \$3.00.)

The author who collects his scattered essays and publishes them in volume form subjects himself to a doubly rigid criticism, for the question immediately arises as to the need or desirability of reprinting what has already been given to the public. Such a miscellany is justified if the essays are too valuable to remain

hidden in inaccessible magazine files, if they achieve that rare distinction of style which makes a book of informal essays charming because of its very discursiveness, or if they are so closely related to each other that their real significance demands the continuity of a single volume. *Segments of Southern Thought* does not qualify under any of these headings. All but three of its seventeen chapters have been published within the last five years and are readily available in most libraries; and although some of them are very capably written, others suggest hasty composition, and none are really distinguished. As for the third point, the author hopes that "the consistency in philosophical outlook may give some unification to the diverse matters" about which he has written.

The introductory essay, "On Banishing Nonsense," sets forth this attitude in a somewhat naïve exposition of the humanist-agrarian—or "agrarian-distributist"—quarrel with standardization, scientific mechanization, and urbanization which has been filling the periodicals for the last decade. The author even hopes that this regional approach will justify the inclusion of the last two essays, "Eugene O'Neill's Symbolism" and "A Biographical Essay on George Borrow"—which occupy one fourth of the book, incidentally; otherwise, their inclusion is "traceable only to the author's whim." Since the reviewer finds them in no way germane to Southern thought, he will be indulged in a similar whim if he passes them by. Two others call for no consideration here, "Six Southern Novels" and "Mark Twain as Southerner," for they do not rise above the level of competent book reviewing, in spite of the extraordinary thesis of the latter that the "ordeal" of Clemens consisted in the fact that he was a transplanted Southerner.

Of the remaining twelve chapters, six are purely miscellaneous side lights on Southern life and literature, of varying merit. The biographical sketch of Richard Malcolm Johnston, now first published, probably owes its lack of interest chiefly to the dreary life and works of this minor local colorist from Georgia. On the other hand, "Frances Wright at Nashoba"—an account of the protégé of Jeremy Bentham who founded a short-lived Utopia in Tennessee, 1826-1830, for the philosophical as well as the physical emancipation of Negro slaves—is an amusing story, engagingly told. A third, printed in 1937 as a satisfactory introduction to the Black Cat Press edition of *Sut Lovingood Travels with Old Abe Lincoln*, certainly does not need reprinting so soon. Good or bad, at least none of these are strongly colored by the regional point of view. But "Walter Hines Page" and "Sawney Webb" are; here the author's philosophical springboard launches him in a timely and able plunge into the controversial waters of Old South vs. New South, and though he properly sinks the bloated reputation of Page, the literate Babbitt who blindly worshipped the New, he rescues a doubtful hero in the corpse of Webb, who clung like a barnacle to the Old as a classical schoolmaster in Tennessee. The reviewer, like most spectators who strive for objectivity, finds that as usual he is convinced by

the negative rather than the positive conclusions of academicians. The last essay in this group, "Southern Towns and Cities," is a well-written survey, although it served its purpose as such better in its original context as a chapter in the symposium, *Culture in the South* (1934); further, to one who has lived in several of these towns and cities, it has a Pathé-News quality that is more glib than convincing.

The remaining six essays are by far the best in the book, its only substantial segments of Southern thought. Four of them particularly (and they constitute one third of the book) hang together with a unity of design not to be found elsewhere in this miscellany. This is undoubtedly to be accounted for by the fact that they were written with a unity of purpose. "The Background of Southern Thought," "Southern Poetic Theory," and "Southern Poetry" originally formed the introduction to an anthology of *Southern Poets* (1936), and the fourth, "Legaré and Grayson," although published the next year as a separate article, should have been included in that introduction, for it overlaps and repeats as much as it supplements. In spite of this, and in spite of the fact that they all remain readily accessible in their original printing, these essays constitute the best running history of the subject yet written. Professor Parks has read widely in the Southern poets, both major and minor, and he has thought clearly and sanely about them. His judgments on their artistic achievements are usually sound and, what is better, original, although one feels that Poe and Lanier have been somewhat slighted because of their tendency to spill out of the Old South tradition—Poe as a sometime resident of New York and Lanier as a confused advocate of the New South. There are also occasional slips in biographical fact and literary history, but this is inevitable in the present state of research in the Southern field. But on the whole these four essays constitute a stimulating body of criticism and point the way, again, to the many monographs and biographies of Southern authors which must be written (and based on genuine scholarly research) before any articulation about Southern culture can become adequate. The fifth essay in this group, "Urban Influences on Ante-Bellum Writers," now first published, contains a mass of new and interesting information, but it is ineffective because badly fused. The final essay, "A Note on Southern Literature," is thesis-ridden: the South is not as fortunate as New England in that it did not communicate its way of life by translating it into an adequate literature for later generations; hence the need to find again that integration which we have lost, and only the agrarian-distributists are offering it to us. Seeing through these spectacles, the author places an extravagant estimate on the poetry and theories of Tate, Ransome, and Davidson, throughout these six best essays. But partisanship is not the weakness of this miscellaneous volume of somewhat misleadingly entitled *Segments of Southern Thought*.

Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901: As Revealed in the Correspondence of Herbert B. Adams. Edited by W. Stull Holt. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 314. \$2.50.)

From the extensive correspondence of Herbert Baxter Adams, the editor made a selection of 181 letters for the purpose of contributing to a "better understanding of historical scholarship in America during the most significant period of its development." Twenty-five of the letters were written by Adams himself; the remaining 156 by Frederick J. Turner, John S. Bassett, Woodrow Wilson, J. Franklin Jameson, and other former students of Adams at Johns Hopkins University, who were pioneering in the professional study, teaching and writing of "scientific" history, and by James Bryce, Daniel C. Gilman, James Schouler, Theodore Roosevelt, Walter Hines Page, Henry Adams, and others. If the achievement of his purpose is a criterion, the editor seems to have made a judicious selection of letters.

During the quarter century from Adams' appointment as a fellow in Johns Hopkins University in 1876 to his death in 1901, historical scholarship and writing became less and less the avocation of lawyers, clergymen, and business men, and more and more the profession of trained college and university professors; graduate instruction, the seminar method, and advanced degrees became firmly fixed as prerequisites for admission to the historical profession; the specialized monograph became the characteristic form of scholarly historical writing; history came to be regarded as a "science" as well as a branch of literature; and there was notable improvement in the quality and increase in the quantity of historical production. This unique collection of letters by professional historians, dealing with courses, students, texts, subjects of investigation, jobs, and other professional matters, is chiefly significant for its delineation of the establishment and spread of historical scholarship in the United States. Adams took great pleasure in the expanding colonial system of Johns Hopkins as represented on a wall map by pins stuck wherever a former student was teaching.

The correspondence shows definitely the pivotal position of Adams and Johns Hopkins University in American historical scholarship after 1876. It throws some light on the organization of the American Historical Association in 1884, the establishment of the *American Historical Review* in 1895, the planning of *The American Nation* as the first general history of the United States written by the young professional historians, the sensational launching in 1882 of the Johns Hopkins University *Studies in Historical and Political Science* as the first avenue in the United States for the publication of historical monographs, and the rise of Adams to national and even international distinction. Adams declined various offers of more lucrative professorships and administrative positions elsewhere. The letters confirm the general understanding that his claim to fame rests rather on his skill and success as administrator, organizer, editor, inspirer

of students, and promoter of systematic scholarship than on his research and writing.

Though Adams had studied for nearly three years in German universities, the letters show clearly that he esteemed French scholarship highly, that his respect for German scholarship was not unqualified, that he was in much closer contact with English than with German scholars, and that American scholars studying abroad were coming to the belief that German historical scholarship was hardly equal to that in American universities. Has the reputed dominant influence of German scholarship on American historians in the period been exaggerated?

The student of American history as well as historiography will find the Adams correspondence useful. In addition to data on Adams, other American historians, and the historical profession, the letters present interesting side lights on extension work, academic freedom, administrative procedures, and political interference in higher educational institutions.

Of especial interest to students of the South are the intellectual, political, and educational conditions described in letters of Adams and Lyon G. Tyler from Virginia, William P. Trent from the University of the South in Tennessee, John H. T. McPherson from the University of Georgia, and John S. Bassett from Trinity College in North Carolina. Trent, McPherson, and Bassett were irked by Southern intolerance, provincialism, and prejudice. Bassett, in disagreement with the prevailing ideas of his native North Carolina, wrote frankly and at length to his professor on the agrarian hostility to trusts, the absurdity of the Democratic charge of "Negro rule," the Red Shirt and White Supremacy campaigns of 1898 and 1900, and the Wilmington race riot of 1898 as orgies of racial passion and prejudice, and the suffrage amendment of 1900 as "an enamelled lie" and "one more step in the educating of our people that it is right to lie, to steal, & to defy all honesty in order to keep a certain party in power" (p. 265). Believing that the acquiescing Negro could not help himself, he suggested that Northern philanthropists might help the Negro by helping to educate the white man in Southern denominational colleges, for the "way to appeal to the Southerner is through his religion" (p. 261). He condemned the verdict awarded to Thomas Jefferson Gattis (incorrectly spelled "Gottis" on pp. 291-92) in his suit against President Kilgo of Trinity College for slander as a "political verdict" based on the prejudice of the jury against the Duke tobacco trust.

The editor has included a discriminating introduction, an adequate index, a list of the letters by date and correspondent, and a list of the letters by author to implement this volume of selected correspondence which will be a valuable source for students of American history and historiography.

Wider Horizons of American History, by Herbert E. Bolton. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1939. Pp. xv, 191. \$1.50.)

This rather slender volume is composed of four essays delivered by Dr. Bolton before learned groups. These essays are specifically, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution" delivered in 1917, "Defensive Spanish Expansion and the Significance of the Borderlands," 1929, "The Epic of Greater America," 1932, and "The Black Robes of New Spain" delivered in 1934.

It is plain that this collection, covering almost twenty years of highly productive work, forms a valuable tracing of the growth and development of an idea. The colonial history of the Southwest, once largely in the kindly but inexpert hands of clerical dilettantes, is now attracting the attention of an increasing body of vigorous researchers both lay and clerical.

From a wealth of material concerning the history of the Spanish Southwest, Dr. Bolton has distilled these essays. Their significance lies in that they call upon the historian to revise further the popular concept of the American frontier. Largely through the efforts of men such as R. G. Thwaites and the author of these essays it has become necessary to modify the Turner theory so sharply that it has virtually become a regional thesis applicable to only a relatively small section of the United States. The handful yet remaining, who defend the generalization that the American frontier was the product of the coonskin cap, corn liquor, and the old-time religion will find it difficult to fit Dr. Bolton's book into their scheme of things. He treats of a frontier that does not follow the pattern upon which the Turner thesis was created.

It should be gratifying to us to know that during the years in which the traditional Anglo-Saxon pioneer was rediscovering the territory to the east of the Mississippi, vacated by French and Spanish, Father Reyes could comment casually that in his California community "Mass is chanted with harps and violins," and Father Engelhardt could complain because "As an absolutely necessary means to win the souls of the savages, these unworldly men [missionaries] accepted the disagreeable task of conducting huge farms, teaching and supervising various mechanical trades, having an eye on the livestock and herders, and making ends meet generally." Such a plan of colonial conquest and such a scheme of civilization does not resemble the Eastern frontier.

While the cultural penetration of the Southwest by the Spanish is the central theme of these essays, Dr. Bolton points its significance by arguing with persuasive eloquence the doctrine of cultural interchange as a measure of ultimate civilization. It is difficult to avoid the implication that the Southwest would do well to cling to its Spanish heritage and absorb only such Anglo-Saxon culture as is necessary in the modern world.

The essays have further value in that they serve as testimony to the fact that while the ancient bonds binding literature to history have been sorely strained

in recent time, yet they are not entirely broken. The purist might complain that the author exhibits a flair for the theatrical, a complaint not without foundation.

Louisiana State University

EDWARD OTT

Black Folk, Then and Now: An Essay in the History and Sociology of the Negro Race. By W. E. Burghardt Du Bois. (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939. Pp. xi, 401. Bibliography. \$3.50.)

In the preface to this new book, Dr. Du Bois explains that for some six years he has been endeavoring to promote an encyclopedia of the Negro, but to date his efforts have not come to fruition. "Meantime," he says, "it has seemed to me not out of place to do again, and I hope somewhat more thoroughly, the task which I attempted twenty-three years ago in a little volume of the Home University Library, called *The Negro*. This book incorporates some of that former essay, but for the most part is an entirely new production and seeks to bring to notice the facts concerning the Negro. . . . I do not doubt that my Negro descent and narrow group culture have in many cases predisposed me to interpret my facts too favorably for my race" (pp. viii-ix).

Having been given this clear and candid statement of purpose and bias, the reader is prepared to find the author refuting with some heat the dictum of Guernier that "Alone among the continents Africa has no history." The Grimaldi-Negroids, (perhaps) the ancestors of the talented Cro-Magnons, masters of Europe in the later Aurignacian Age, were doubtless of African origin. The ancient Egyptians, if not exactly Negro in the narrower meaning of the word, were at least "Black Folk" (or certainly not white), and among them were definite Negro and Negroid elements, including a number of the Pharaohs. The valleys of the Niger and Congo as well as the Lakes and Cape regions have a long and rich, albeit relatively little known, history. The culture of the Africans embraced the industrial arts and handicrafts, agriculture, cattle raising, and statecraft which reached even in early times a stage far beyond merely tribal organizations. Enervating climate, invasions, and especially the slave trade, not only arrested but actually set back these flourishing cultures. Naturally Dr. Du Bois rejects as a reason for the backwardness of Negroid peoples the older idea of the innate inferiority of black people as compared with white or yellow. In doing so, he points out with justice that the weight of modern anthropological science supports his view.

In his chapters on the Negro in America, Dr. Du Bois condenses into smaller compass what he has written elsewhere—notably his recent book entitled *Black Reconstruction*. He has several chapters on the imperial penetration and partition of Africa by the various European states which have holdings in the vast continent. He shows how the government and industry of those colonies redound

to the benefit mainly of the whites while the blacks perform all or nearly all of the hard labor.

All this constitutes a challenge to the future of world democracy. In effect he poses the question: How can political democracy be transformed into industrial democracy (the logical next step in democratic development) even in the so-called "Great Democracies," so long as there persists among the white European and American workers a conviction that black folk are inherently inferior and hence are to be forever omitted from consideration in planning for the democracy of tomorrow? "The proletariat of the world," he says, "consists . . . overwhelmingly of the dark workers of Asia, Africa, the islands of the sea, and South and Central America. These are the ones who are supporting a superstructure of wealth, luxury, and extravagance. It is the rise of these people that is the rise of the world. The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line" (p. 383).

Altogether *Black Folk* is an arresting and thoughtful book and carries a message and a warning which white folk cannot afford to ignore.

Woman's College of the University of North Carolina B. B. KENDRICK

The Black Man in White America. By John G. Van Deusen. (Washington, D. C.: Associated Publishers, Inc., 1938. Pp. ix, 338. Bibliography. \$3.25.)

This book is in happy contrast to the usual run of tomes touching the subject of race relations which issue from the pens of Negro authors. Professor Van Deusen's study is outstanding for its scholarliness, its scope, its saneness, and its attempt at fairness in dealing with highly controversial subjects. It seeks to avoid extremes in consideration of all angles of the Negro problem. The author launches his study with a discussion of "Race Inferiority." In this initial chapter he sets forth many of the inconveniences and injustices suffered by Negroes in regard to education, recreation, travel, health, housing, and administration of the law. In subsequent chapters he elaborates these subjects and introduces many new ones. The unhappy condition of the Negro farmer is set forth in vivid terms. Cases of peonage are cited and decried. But the author does not attribute all the woes of the colored farmers to grasping white overlords. Indolence, instability, and thriftlessness on the part of the Negroes are frankly admitted as contributing greatly to their plight. The city wage earner is pictured as being little better off than the farmer. His work is apt to be irregular; his wages are low; his hours are long; his tenure is precarious; his vocations are restricted to less desirable pursuits. In all respects his status compares unfavorably with that of white men engaged in similar activities.

In recent years great numbers of Negroes have left the Republican party to vote with the Democrats. In many instances, as Professor Van Deusen points out, they have profited by the change. But, according to the author, the New

Deal has proven disastrous to Negroes in many ways. The government's crop reducing program resulted in the eviction of many Negro farmers and the lion's share of the benefit payments went to the white landlords. If Negroes attempted to get relief jobs they met discrimination in regard to both work and wages. Those in industrial pursuits profited little from the various attempts to secure collective bargaining and wage-hour regulations. In fact, the author terms the Negro "The Forgotten Man of the New Deal," and New Deal measures are referred to as schemes which, as far as the Negro is concerned "go 'round and around' and come out nowhere" (p. 122).

The author has stimulating chapters on the Negro criminal, the mob, the public school, the Negro college, the Negro church, the Negro press, Negro leadership, and the Negro's contribution to literature and to art. Most interesting is the discussion of the Negro and his songs. Samples are given of various types of Negro tunes and these are followed by lucid interpretive comments.

The readability of the book is impaired considerably by a piling up of statistics, and this in spite of a professed contempt for figures:

Figures must be
Properly compiled,
Adequately presented,
Thoughtfully interpreted,
And even then they lie like hell (p. 130).

Occasionally the narrative is brightened, however, by spicy phrases. For example, in evaluating the New Deal's slum clearance project for Negroes, the author says: "But no matter how you slice it, it's still baloney" (p. 121). And again, in discussing the Scottsboro episode, he says: "In the first trial the district attorney waved Victoria Price's cotton underwear in the air demanding that the jury convict the Negroes and 'defend Southern womanhood.' In the fourth trial he was still flourishing the undergarments (though they had now mysteriously changed to silk) and calling on the jury to burn the accused as a rebuke to . . . Jew money supporting the defense" (pp. 134-35).

The author concludes that "there is no immediate solution for the Negro problem." He disapproves radical programs such as those suggested by Du Bois' *Crisis* and Randolph's *Messenger*. He sets forth as "a reasonable goal toward which to work" the following program: "the cessation of economic exploitation, proper living conditions in cities, the end of lynching, a guarantee of justice in the courts, provision for better educational facilities, and the right to vote, subject to an educational qualification honestly administered" (p. 296). The solution of the Negro problem, he says, calls for patience on the part of both races and a solution can come only through education and understanding.

Black Workers and the New Unions. By Horace R. Cayton and George S. Mitchell. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xviii, 473. Bibliography, tables, and appendixes. \$4.00.)

Two social scientists have examined in a scholarly and practical way the problem of Negro labor in the light of history and in relation to white labor, North and South, under the impact of the New Deal, with respect to the three basic industries of iron and steel, meat-packing, and railroad car shops. Their study is based upon nine hundred interviews with workers, plant managers, foremen, and union leaders, and is supported by valuable statistical information. It is the third in a series of studies projected in 1933 by a special Committee on Negroes in the Economic Reconstruction. The first was *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy*, by Charles S. Johnson, Edwin R. Embree, and W. W. Alexander, published in 1935; the second, *A Preface to Peasantry*, by Arthur F. Raper, was published in 1936. *Black Workers and the New Unions* has a foreword by Charles S. Johnson.

The Cayton-Mitchell study, although essentially a social and economic survey of current trends, is, in a sketchy sense, an excursion into Southern history, for Negro labor is largely in the South or has largely come out of the South. One section of the book is given over to the Birmingham district, with attention to historical background. The authors frankly find that upper-class Negroes, including members of the professions, have been pretty generally antagonistic to the labor union movement, partly as a result of the historic rivalry between slaves and "poor whites," partly because, in former days of unionism, there was a strong tendency by white workers to keep Negroes out of unions and otherwise exploit them. The Negroes preferred exploitation by white employers to exploitation by white employees who wished to keep them out of industry. This situation in the labor front tended to give employers the advantageous position of being able to "divide and rule." But, particularly since the vogue of the New Deal, Negroes have come into labor unions in substantial numbers, and there are labor leaders of both races who see their duty as that of bringing together white and colored workers whom capitalists have attempted to keep apart.

Radical activities within the labor movement in different sections are treated with objectivity, both as a militant influence and as a red herring used by anti-union employers. It is pointed out that the present Negro leadership will not likely encourage Negro workers to fight against capitalistic interests.

This book of solid information also contains an important recommendation. The authors urge that there be a Negro liaison organization in the field of labor relations, somewhat after the manner of the United Hebrew Trades. Such a Negro establishment could organize the unorganized in co-operation with existing unions, serve as a channel of information, protect Negroes against discrimi-

nation, and seek to break down white workers' prejudices against Negroes. The work is a balance between diagnosis and proposed remedy. It is a good study on the South and on the Negro, and it is fair, factual, and timely.

University of Missouri

H. CLARENCE NIXON

Forty Acres and Steel Mules. By Herman C. Nixon. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. viii, 98. Bibliography, illustrations. \$2.50.)

In physical appearance the book is like an elementary school geography. This style of format was apparently chosen to provide room for a great number of photographs obtained from the Division of Information of the Farm Security Administration. Besides its 97 pages of print the book contains 32 pages of pictures, illustrating in the main poverty, squalor, and quaint conditions. Whether only this sort of pictures was obtainable from the collection used or the author chose to use only this kind, the net result tends to distort perspective. For example, the shabby schoolhouses on page 83 would compare sadly with most of the schoolhouses in the rural and village South.

The title of the work leads one to expect a study of the so-called "one-horse" farmer in relation to mechanized and large-scale farming, but it deals with a multitude of phases of Southern rural and urban life. It is another book in the rapidly expanding volume of literature dealing with the ills of the South. The study is not history but as the author himself says, "It is an attempt to interpret the rural South and the village South in the light of the inevitable trends of the time." There is little new to those who, with open eyes, have grown up in the environment discussed. The South is being much thumped and probed by the social pathologists. Unfortunately the doctors are much more effective in diagnosis than therapeutics. The good diagnostician, however, investigates carefully the history of his case. Historian himself, Dr. Nixon has generally avoided the historical approach, except in Chapter IV, which is the best chapter in the book. He did not follow his own prescription. Referring to the attack of two groups on the AAA (p. 18) for the plight of the cotton tenants, he says they criticized without seeing the problem as a whole and in historical perspective. "It must be remembered that the ills of tenancy are cumulative, compounded of many causes, and accompanied by other ills." No analysis of Southern life can be wholly satisfying and no solution for the grave social and economic problems of the South is likely to be found which ignores the historical background.

The style of the book is, generally speaking, simple, clear, and vivid. There are, however, some involved sentences and the discussion is interlarded here and there with slang phrases and sophisticated economic parlance. There are occasional slips, like "free gift" (p. 11).

nation, and seek to break down white workers' prejudices against Negroes. The work is a balance between diagnosis and proposed remedy. It is a good study on the South and on the Negro, and it is fair, factual, and timely.

University of Missouri

H. CLARENCE NIXON

Forty Acres and Steel Mules. By Herman C. Nixon. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1938. Pp. viii, 98. Bibliography, illustrations. \$2.50.)

In physical appearance the book is like an elementary school geography. This style of format was apparently chosen to provide room for a great number of photographs obtained from the Division of Information of the Farm Security Administration. Besides its 97 pages of print the book contains 32 pages of pictures, illustrating in the main poverty, squalor, and quaint conditions. Whether only this sort of pictures was obtainable from the collection used or the author chose to use only this kind, the net result tends to distort perspective. For example, the shabby schoolhouses on page 83 would compare sadly with most of the schoolhouses in the rural and village South.

The title of the work leads one to expect a study of the so-called "one-horse" farmer in relation to mechanized and large-scale farming, but it deals with a multitude of phases of Southern rural and urban life. It is another book in the rapidly expanding volume of literature dealing with the ills of the South. The study is not history but as the author himself says, "It is an attempt to interpret the rural South and the village South in the light of the inevitable trends of the time." There is little new to those who, with open eyes, have grown up in the environment discussed. The South is being much thumped and probed by the social pathologists. Unfortunately the doctors are much more effective in diagnosis than therapeutics. The good diagnostician, however, investigates carefully the history of his case. Historian himself, Dr. Nixon has generally avoided the historical approach, except in Chapter IV, which is the best chapter in the book. He did not follow his own prescription. Referring to the attack of two groups on the AAA (p. 18) for the plight of the cotton tenants, he says they criticized without seeing the problem as a whole and in historical perspective. "It must be remembered that the ills of tenancy are cumulative, compounded of many causes, and accompanied by other ills." No analysis of Southern life can be wholly satisfying and no solution for the grave social and economic problems of the South is likely to be found which ignores the historical background.

The style of the book is, generally speaking, simple, clear, and vivid. There are, however, some involved sentences and the discussion is interlarded here and there with slang phrases and sophisticated economic parlance. There are occasional slips, like "free gift" (p. 11).

Geographic influences, farm tenancy, towns and villages, merchants and markets, and local industries are discussed with understanding, cleverness, and clarity. There are some mistakes and misleading statements, which almost inevitably occur in brief general discussions. An industrial expansion in the South between 1850 and 1860 is mentioned (p. 50), but the total value of manufactured products in the South in 1860 was less than that of 1850. Many will be surprised at the statement (p. 20) that social democracy was one of the major issues of Reconstruction. The connection between the Civil War and Reconstruction and the baneful crop-lien system is not emphasized and the hindrance of the system to progressive agriculture and to co-operation among the farmers in the past and present is barely recognized. Likewise protective tariffs, rate discriminations, and the financial drain of outside capital upon every phase of business in the South are not sufficiently emphasized as factors in the "colonial economy," or economic bondage of the South. Nor is the cotton control program of the New Deal mentioned as a factor in the loss of foreign markets for cotton (p. 91). The crop-lien system was more than a "best bid for credit" after Reconstruction (p. 20), it was a necessity. The supply merchant emphasized cotton planting not merely to procure more business but as the best available security for his "advances." The Negro couplet, quoted on page 21, is extravagant, although the Negro was often exploited. Many persons go barefooted in summer not because of poverty but for comfort (p. 13), and the inflow of outsiders into the South is not mentioned in the discussion (p. 10) of the frightful loss to the South by the exodus of its own people. The book is somewhat marred by the author's evident sympathy for the underdog, white or black, and a prejudice against landlords and business men on "Main Street" who "know how to live on the labors of others."

Dr. Nixon not only attempts diagnosis but he also points to certain lines of treatment without being venturesomely specific. To be sure he does not tell us what is to become of the great body of small farmers and tenants who will find it impossible, he believes, to compete in staple production with mechanized and capitalistic farming, nor what is to be done with those who should be removed from submarginal lands. He approves, of course, scientific agriculture, including a scientific use of lands, soil husbandry, reforestation, organization of laborers and tenants with state aid and ballots for all, black apparently as well as white, and recommends land reforms so as to have a general situation of "farms for farmers," as in European countries. He advocates "villages for villagers," a revival of old-fashioned community spirit and co-operation, in spite of modern conditions that militate against it, with government aid and action. He strikes a strong note for social planning with the aid of state and national government. The TVA is endorsed as a great scheme of social planning, "the strongest card in the New Deal." The book closes with a discussion of the "South's Role in the Nation."

As one whose experience with farming and farmers is quite as extensive as the author's, and who has had a large experience with sawmilling besides, I should like to add to Dr. Nixon's statement of the causes of the farmers' woes the fact that the farmers themselves are to blame for much of their troubles. The author is probably correct in his view that small farmers and "tenants are largely victims of a social rather than a biological heritage," but inertia, lack of initiative and planning, the habit of idleness, and slipshod methods of farm management, together with the inescapable hazards of farming, are basic factors in farm poverty. No manner of governmental paternalism and regimentation will solve the farmers' problems as long as these conditions last.

While *Forty Acres and Steel Mules* has its imperfections and contains views that will be challenged by many competent persons, it has the merit of being vivid, interesting, and thought-provoking. It could not have been written except by one who has been an alert firsthand observer, and a zealous student for many years of the complicated problems discussed. It is well worth a careful reading.

University of Alabama

ALBERT B. MOORE

Caldwell and Company: A Southern Financial Empire. By John Berry McFerrin.

(Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. x, 284.
Bibliography, appendixes. \$3.50.)

In early November, 1930, a financial storm struck with full force over the banking house of Caldwell and Company; almost immediately the entire South was brought to the sudden realization that its financial structure was shaken to its very foundations. Originally created to help Southern communities in the sale of their bonds, Caldwell and Company was destined to bring about an intensification of the depression in the South. The company was chartered in 1917 by Rogers Caldwell in Nashville, Tennessee, as a small underwriter and distributor of municipal bonds. It was sufficiently well established by the end of the World War to take advantage of the general prosperity and the rapid industrialization, urbanization, and road building in the South.

From the very beginning Caldwell allowed his company to be carried along in the general trend of investment banking toward the disastrous collapse. By 1925 Caldwell and Company was the largest bond house in the South, and from 1926 to 1929 it was regarded as the outstanding factor in the whole economic structure of that section. Its ramifications reached beyond financial and commercial enterprise into politics. Prudence was considered axiomatic of profit; queasy doubts disappeared. Technicalities were lost in the fog of subsidiary corporations. All the new fields that were entered were taken over primarily to increase prestige and profit. Haphazard internal accounting, infrequent audits, a disregard for traditional and standard safeguards made the company's practices more dangerously unsound and illegal. The "Morgan of

the South" continually indulged in all the types of legal chicanery and shrouded financial policy that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency with Ferdinand Pecora as counsel discovered among the "bigger fry" in 1933-1934.

After desperate negotiations with BankoKentucky, Caldwell and Company were unable to meet their commitments. Liquidation left the Caldwell interests only the comparatively unimportant Apex Oil Company as a business re-entry. Rogers Caldwell and his father became legal owners of its controlling stock in 1937 and took over the management of this organization. But apparently the habit of engaging in flighty ventures was not forgotten for, since Professor McFerrin's volume has been released, a Chancery Court suit charging the Caldwell family group with mismanagement and the transferring of Apex assets "illegally and improperly to dummy corporations owned and controlled" by them was announced on August 19, 1939. The Barge Oil Company, the Superior Corporation, the Ferrolene Sales Corporation, and the Red Ace Petroleum Company, Incorporated, were listed as defendants and were charged with serving as the dummy corporations.

In studying the rise and fall of this financial organization and its political triumvirate, Dr. McFerrin has endeavored to "portray against the background of Southern economic development during the 20's the history of an enterprise whose remarkably rapid growth and tragic collapse constitute a unique episode in Southern finance" (p. vii). His treatise is thoughtful, critical, and analytical. Devoid of loud muckraking terms, Dr. McFerrin draws strong indictments from reasoned conclusions. In respect to the company's public obligations, he concludes: "Caldwell and Company can be justly charged with violating sound business ethics, assuming such to exist, in at least two respects: namely, first, actual violation of law; and second, carrying through those transactions which, while technically within the law, were of such a nature that they should clearly be outside the code of business morals" (p. 249). On the political activity of Colonel Luke Lea, Rogers Caldwell, and the state administration the author pronounces condemnation. In connection with the failure of impeachment proceedings against the Governor of Tennessee, he writes: "If civil units are ever to obtain good government they must take action against those officials who are derelict in the performance of their duties and Governor Horton certainly was in this class" (pp. 203-204).

Dr. McFerrin has woven elusive and unusual source material into a well-written history of every aspect of this complex financial house. Failing as a business unit, it also failed as a contributor to Southern development. This must be considered not as an indication that the South is unable to help solve its own problems but as an indictment of unrestrained license in the business world itself.

University of Chattanooga

JAMES W. LIVINGOOD

COMMUNICATION

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, WASHINGTON

August 10, 1939

Dr. Wendell H. Stephenson
Managing Editor, The Journal of Southern History
University, Louisiana

Dear Dr. Stephenson:

Without any criticism of Professor W. F. Craven's scholarly review of H. C. Forman's *Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance*, which appeared in the August issue of the *Journal of Southern History*, pages 390-92, may we correct an impression which it is possible some people may receive concerning our plans for the Jamestown portion of Colonial National Historical Park, Virginia.

Mr. Forman is no longer connected with the Jamestown archeological project and his "encouragement of further attempts to reconstruct lost colonial buildings" is not inspired by the National Park Service plan for the Jamestown area. The National Park Service has not yet reconstructed any of the lost buildings on Jamestown Island and does not plan to reconstruct any of them. Possible exception might be made if original building plans, or other detailed and indubitable evidence concerning the physical appearance and construction of these buildings should come to light, but that is not probable.

The Jamestown project is, and is expected to remain, primarily an archeological project. If preservatives for 17th century brick can be found, the streets, walks, and foundations discovered by the archeologist may be exposed to the view of the public much as is done in Italy at Pompeii. Otherwise, the 17th century City of Jamestown will be envisioned in the Jamestown archeological laboratory and museum, where a wealth of architectural data and artifact material of all description lays bare the architectural, social, and technological history of the pioneer Virginian at his capital, 1607-1699.

Sincerely yours,

RONALD F. LEE
Supervisor of Historic Sites

Historical News and Notices

As announced in the August issue of the *Journal*, the fifth annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association will convene in Lexington, Kentucky, on Thursday afternoon, November 2, and continue in session until Saturday noon, November 4. Headquarters will be at the Lafayette Hotel. Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky, co-chairman of the local arrangements committee, announces a complimentary luncheon, a complimentary dinner, and a reception at the home of President and Mrs. Frank L. McVey. Professor Clark is also arranging an auto tour of Lexington and the adjacent Bluegrass region, "without any cost whatever to members of the Association." He will appreciate advance information as to the number desiring to make the trip. The Filson Club, the Kentucky State Historical Society, and the Bradford Club are co-operating in planning for the meeting, and the Thursday evening dinner will be a joint session of the several societies.

PERSONAL

Miss Blanche Henry Clark, who recently received the doctorate in history at Vanderbilt University, has been appointed dean of women and assistant professor of history at Transylvania College. She was formerly connected with Ward Belmont Junior College at Nashville.

Thomas P. Govan has resigned his position at the University of Chattanooga to become professor of history at the University of the South.

Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina will be on Kenan leave for the fall quarter of the current academic year.

Announcement has been made of the appointment of Robert D. Meade as professor of history and head of the department at Randolph-Macon College. He replaces Dr. B. W. Arnold, who retired last year. Dr. Meade became associate professor of history at Randolph-Macon in 1936.

Joshua Coffin Chase, president of the Florida Historical Society from 1935 to 1939, has been elected director of the Camden, Maine, Historical Society.

Chase C. Mooney has been appointed professor of history and political science at Brenau College.

Summer research activities of members of the Davidson College faculty: J. A. McGeachy spent the summer in research at the University of Chicago; Frontis W. Johnston, who is working upon a biography of Zebulon B. Vance, utilized the latter part of the summer in research among the Vance Papers in the archives of the North Carolina Historical Commission; and W. P. Cumming of the English department continued his study of early Carolina cartography.

E. Merton Coulter of the University of Georgia taught at the University of Chicago during the second summer session, after which he visited Central America.

The following appointments and promotions have been made in North Carolina colleges and universities: Richard L. Watson, Jr., of Yale University has been appointed instructor in history at Duke University; Percival Perry has been appointed part-time instructor in history at Wake Forest College, replacing Henry S. Stroupe, who is at Duke University doing graduate work; and George Bauerlein of North Carolina State College has been promoted assistant professor of history.

Charles Dykstra, formerly a graduate assistant at Louisiana State University, has been appointed professor of history and government at Sterling College.

The Social Science Research Council has announced the following Southern grant-in-aid appointees for 1939-1940: Wilfrid H. Callcott, University of South Carolina, Caribbean policy of the United States, 1890-1920; Earl F. Cruickshank, Vanderbilt University, European imperialism in Northwestern Africa, 1875-1895; Thomas P. Govan, University of Chattanooga, credit system and cotton trade in the Old South; Shelby T. McCloy, Duke University, government assistance in eighteenth century France; Daniel M. Robison, Vanderbilt University, the Whig tradition in the Solid South; and Austin L. Venable, University of Arkansas, the public career of William L. Yancey. Other grant-in-aid appointments to members of the historical guild for work on subjects of interest to students of Southern history: Abbot E. Smith, Bard College, Columbia University, indentured servants and redemptioners in the American colonies; and Vertrees J. Wyckoff, St. John's College, economic history of Maryland during the seventeenth century. Predoctoral field fellowships were granted to Richard M. Carrigan, Princeton University, social and economic conditions of South Carolina; and Seth Hammond, Harvard University, problems of the United States cotton industry, 1910-1937.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History has recently acquired 100 issues of the weekly *Columbus Patron of Husbandry*, May 3, 1879-January 20, 1883; and, as a gift from John Wendell Bailey of the University of Richmond, 50 issues of the bimonthly *Winona Baptist Layman*, September 1, 1894-October 8, 1896; 366 issues of the weekly *Jackson Record*, November 16, 1898-January 4, 1906; and 321 issues of the weekly *Jackson Baptist Record*, January 11, 1906-February 29, 1912.

Several tons of records from Washington and Ottawa counties have been acquired by the Oklahoma Historical Society, through the co-operation of the Historical Records Survey.

The Virginia Historical Society has received as gifts many letters and records dating from the latter part of the seventeenth century; wills and other manuscripts relating to the Grinnan, Bryan, and Urquhart families; a copy of the Trumbell portrait of George Wythe in Independence Hall, painted and presented by Mrs. Olaf Saugstad; a portrait of George Washington by Charles Peale Polk; and a counterpane 165 years old owned by the mother of John Randolph of Roanoke.

R. S. Cotterill of Florida State College for Women is the author of *A Short History of the Americas* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939, pp. xviii, 459, \$2.50). The purpose of the volume is "to give the student a general acquaintance with the entire field of American history and at the same time to supply sufficient information to serve as a foundation for advanced work in national or regional fields."

The past decade has witnessed the publication of sundry centennial histories of institutions of higher learning in the South. One of these, Dorothy L. Gilbert, *Guildford, A Quaker College* (Guildford College, N. C., 1937, pp. 359), escaped the *Journal's* attention until too late to be reviewed. The work is a valuable contribution to the growing literature on educational institutions in the South.

The Negro in Brazil, by Arthur Ramos, translated from the Portuguese by Richard Pattie (Washington, D. C.: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1939, pp. xx, 203), considers the slave trade and slavery, slave insurrections, the abolitionist movement, the cultural heritage of the Brazilian Negro, and the Negro in art, music, literature, science, war, and politics.

The United States Department of Agriculture Library has recently issued several bibliographical contributions, compiled by Everett E. Edwards, Agricultural Economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics: No. 33 (September, 1938),

"References on American Colonial Agriculture"; No. 34 (January, 1939), "References on Agriculture in the Life of the Nation"; No. 26 (Edition 2, January, 1939), "Selected References on the History of Agriculture in the United States"; No. 25 (Edition 2, April, 1939), "References on the Significance of the Frontier in American History"; and No. 27 (Edition 2, April, 1939), "A List of American Economic Histories."

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Booksellers and Circulating Libraries in Colonial Maryland," by Joseph T. Wheeler, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "Jeb Stuart in Maryland, June, 1863," by George C. Keidel, *ibid.*
- "A Note on the Minutes of the House of Delegates, February 10-March 13, 1777," by Elizabeth W. Meade, *ibid.*
- "Roger Brooke Taney and the Tenets of Democracy," by Carl B. Swisher, *ibid.* (September).
- "Wenlocke Christison's Plantation, 'The Ending of Controversie,'" by Henry C. Forman, *ibid.*
- "Thomas Bray and the Maryland Parochial Libraries," by Joseph T. Wheeler, *ibid.*
- "Ships and Shipping of Seventeenth Century Maryland," continued, by V. J. Wychoff, *ibid.*
- "Lord Dunmore and the Pennsylvania-Virginia Boundary Dispute," by Percy B. Caley, in the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* (June).
- "Captain John Smith's Attitudes toward the Indians," by William Randel, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "Red House, Rockbridge County, Virginia," by Francis Lee Thurman, *ibid.*
- "Career of Col. Charles Broadwater, Fairfax County, Va.," by Robert Lee Haycock, *ibid.*
- "Salvaging Revolutionary Relics from the York River," by Homer L. Ferguson, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).
- "The First Colonial Grammar in English," by Grace Warren Landrum, *ibid.*
- "Cedar Creek Monthly Meeting and Its Meeting House," by Mrs. Douglas Summers Brown, *ibid.*
- "The Proprietors of Richmond's New Theatre of 1819," by Martin Staples Shockley, *ibid.*
- "The Colonial Churches of Gloucester County, Virginia," by George C. Mason, *ibid.*
- "Zeta at Historic Hampden-Sydney, 1850-1912," by Karl W. Fisher, in *Beta Theta Pi* (February, March).
- "The Career of Montfort Stokes in North Carolina," by William O. Foster, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).

- "The Establishment of the North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts," by David A. Lockmiller, *ibid.*
- "Economic Conditions in North Carolina about 1780," II, by Francis G. Morris and Phyllis M. Morris, *ibid.*
- "The Whigs in the Politics of the Confederacy," by Daniel M. Robison, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1939).
- "Cherokee Removal, An Unnecessary Tragedy," by John P. Brown, *ibid.*
- "James K. Polk and the 'Immortal Thirteen,'" by Powell Moore, *ibid.*
- "Branch Banking in Tennessee Prior to the Civil War," by Claude A. Campbell, *ibid.*
- "The Freedman's Bureau in Tennessee," by Weymouth T. Jordan, *ibid.*
- "John Mason Brown, 1837-1890," by Preston Brown, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).
- "Walker Daniel, the Founder of Danville," by Calvin M. Fackler, *ibid.*
- "Some Early Connections between Kentucky and Tennessee," by Alfred L. Crabb, *ibid.*
- "Kentucky History in Old Depositions: Washington County, Ky.," by Orval W. Baylor, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).
- "The Kentucky Gazette Reports the French Revolution," by Huntley Dupre, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (September).
- "Missouri as a Pioneer in Criminal Court Reform," by A. C. Breckenridge and W. G. Colman, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).
- "Educational Opportunities in Early Missouri," II, by Margaret McMillan and Monia Cook Morris, *ibid.*
- "Chief Thomas Mitchell Buffington and Chief William Charles Rogers," by John Bartlett Meserve, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (June).
- "Fort Davis," by Grant Foreman, *ibid.*
- "Pawnee Traditions and Customs," by Guy Rowley Moore, *ibid.*
- "Francis Bartow Fite, M. D.," by LeRoy Long, *ibid.*
- "New Springplace," by Vinson Lackey, *ibid.*
- "Early Grady County History," by Meta C. Sager, *ibid.*
- "Samuel Thomas Bledsoe," by M. L. Lyles, *ibid.*
- "A Story of Choctaw Chiefs," continued, by Peter James Hudson, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Audubon and His Baltimore Patrons," by Robinson C. Watters, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "Robert Mills and the Washington Monument in Baltimore," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Logs and Papers of Baltimore Privateers, 1812-15," edited by *id.*, *ibid.*
- "Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister," continued, *ibid.*
- "Autobiography of Commodore George N. Hollins," *ibid.* (September).

- "Charles Carroll of Carrollton's Letter Describing the Battle of Baltimore," contributed by W. Stull Holt, *ibid.*
- "Baltimore County Land Records of 1686," contributed by Louis Dow Scisco, *ibid.*
- "Evidences Relating to Westover," in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "The First American Tribute to Lafayette in 1824," edited by Lester J. Cappon, *ibid.*
- "Letters from Old Trunks: From Coles Collection of Preston Papers," *ibid.*
- "Notes from the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, *ibid.*
- "A Shorthand Diary of William Byrd of Westover," by Louis B. Wright, in the *Huntington Library Quarterly* (July).
- "The Colonial Court Records of Lower Norfolk and Norfolk Counties," edited by Marshall W. Butt, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).
- "Amherst County Chancery Suits," edited by Lenora Higginbotham Sweeny, *ibid.*
- "Documents Relating to the Early History of the College of William and Mary and to the History of the Church in Virginia," contributed by Herbert L. Ganter, *ibid.*
- "Notes from Surry County Records which Relate to the College Plantation," contributed by Mrs. Victor W. Stewart, *ibid.*
- "Notes from Amelia County Records which Relate to its Courthouse," contributed by W. S. Morton, *ibid.*
- "Unpublished Letters from North Carolinians to Polk," continued, edited by Elizabeth Gregory McPherson, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).
- "The 'J. Hartsell Memora': The Journal of a Tennessee Captain in the War of 1812," edited by Mary Hardin McCown, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1939).
- "Marriage Notices Appearing in Knoxville Newspapers, 1791-1813," compiled by Carrie C. Deming and Laura E. Luttrell, *ibid.*
- "Writings on Tennessee History, 1938," compiled by Laura E. Luttrell, *ibid.*
- "John D. Shane's Interview with Mrs. John McKinney," edited by Otto A. Rothert, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).
- "Early Marriage Records of Madison County, Kentucky," compiled by W. Rodes Shackelford, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).
- "Mercer County, Kentucky: Abstracts of Wills, Books 5 and 6," contributed by Marie Menaugh, *ibid.*
- "Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*

- "Bourbon Circuit Court Records, Suits in Abstract," by Julia Spencer Ardery, *ibid.*
- "Captain John Fowler of Kentucky and Virginia: Chronology," compiled by Mrs. W. T. Fowler, *ibid.*
- "Letters of George Caleb Bingham to James S. Rollins," VIII, edited by C. B. Rollins, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).
- "Reconnoissance of H. L. Marvin, Chief Engineer for the Kansas Southern Railroad in 1884," edited by James W. Moffitt, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (June).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "John Wesley's Georgia Ministry," by Edgar L. Pennington, in *Church History*, (September).
- "Georgia and the South," by Avery Craven, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Mulberry Grove in Colonial Times," by Savannah Unit, Federal Writers' Project, *ibid.*
- "Two Years at Fort Bartow, 1862-1864," by Rogers W. Young, *ibid.*
- "Atlanta After Forty-Two Years," by Joseph Johnson, in the *Atlanta Historical Bulletin* (April).
- "Captain John Keely: An Informal Reminiscence," by Ella May Thornton, *ibid.*
- "Sue Harper Mims, C. S. B.," by Carolyn Cobb, *ibid.*
- "Development of the Library in Atlanta," by Alma Hill Jamison, *ibid.*
- "Judges of the Superior Courts of Fulton and De Kalb Counties," by John D. Humphries, *ibid.*
- "James Alexander Robertson," by A. Curtis Wilgus, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "Why Two Connecticut Yankees Went South," by Samuel H. Fisher, *ibid.*
- "Materials Relating to British East Florida," by Charles L. Mowat, *ibid.*
- "The Federal Writers' Project in Mississippi," by Eri Douglass, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).
- "The Historical Records Survey in Mississippi," by Percy L. Rainwater, *ibid.*
- "The Natchez Trace: A Federal Highway in the Old Southwest," by Lena Mitchell Jamison, *ibid.*
- "Gaines Trace in Monroe County, Mississippi," by W. A. Evans, *ibid.*
- "Gaines Trace through Eastern Clay County, Mississippi," by Arthur Dugan and J. H. Ervin, *ibid.*
- "Life in New Orleans in the Spanish Period," by Minter Wood, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "The Relations between New Orleans and Latin America, 1810-1824," by Alfred T. Wellborn, *ibid.*

"Blood on the Banquette," by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*

"General Banks and the Radicals," by Harry Williams, in the *New England Quarterly* (June).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Items Relating to Charles Town, S. C., from the Boston News-Letter," contributed by Mrs. Waveland FitzSimmons, annotated by Theodore D. Jersey, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jersey, *ibid.*

"Dr. James Lynah, A Surgeon of the Revolution," annotated by A. S. Salley, *ibid.*

"Journal of Gen. Peter Horry," *id.*, *ibid.*

"Letters of Barnett Hardeman Cody and Others, 1861-1864," I, contributed, with notes, by Edmund Cody Burnett, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).

"Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," XII, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, *ibid.*

"Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," VII, by Julia E. Harn, *ibid.*

"De Kalb County Marriages, 1850," compiled by Franklin M. Garrett, in the *Atlanta Historical Bulletin* (April).

"The St. Augustine Census of 1786," translated and edited by Joseph B. Lockey, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).

"The Panton, Leslie Papers: Continuing the Letters of Edmund Doyle, Trader," *ibid.*

"Mathew Andrew Dunn Letters," edited by Weymouth T. Jordan, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).

"A Murder Case Tried in New Orleans in 1773," edited by Henry P. Dart, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Louis DeClouet's Memorial to the Spanish Government, December 7, 1814," edited by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*

"Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, August-September, 1853," LXXX, by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

"Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, December, 1783," LXII, by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES AND COMPILATIONS

"The Fate of Confederate Archives," by Dallas T. Irvine, in the *American Historical Review* (July).

"Revolt Among Historians: Interpretations in Historiography," by Walter E. Bean, in the *Sewanee Review* (July-September).

- "The Higher Law Controversy," by Frederick E. Welfle, in *Mid-America* (July).
- "Tonti Letters," edited by Jean Delanglez, *ibid.*
- "The Mississippi Valley and Its History," by William O. Lynch, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).
- "British Versus German Traditions in Colonial Agriculture," by Richard H. Shryock, *ibid.*
- "The Archives of the United States: A Documentary History," by Percy S. Flippin, *ibid.*
- "The Richard H. Mockett Diary," edited by James L. Sellers, *ibid.* (September).
- "Frances Wright's Experiment with Negro Emancipation," in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (June).
- "A Southern Journey," by William O. Lynch, *ibid.*

RESEARCH PROJECTS IN SOUTHERN HISTORY
FIRST ANNUAL SUPPLEMENT

Compiled by FRED COLE

This continuation of the list of research projects begun in the November, 1938, issue of the *Journal* follows the form of the first compilation. Some doctoral dissertations have been included that were previously listed either in the *Journal* compilation or the Carnegie Institution *List of Doctoral Dissertations Now in Progress at American Universities, December 1938*, that their status may be noted.

The arrangement is chronological under subject headings except for the alphabetical order of "Biographical" studies. The progress of the project is designated by the following abbreviations: Con. (contemplated), Prog. (in progress), Fin. (finished), Prin. (in press). Except in a few instances where the author did not supply complete data, the approximate time before completion and the probable length in octavo printed pages is indicated. Names of universities and colleges are italicized.

GENERAL

1. American agricultural history. Prog. 800 pp. 3 yrs. Gerald Forbes, *North-eastern (Okla.) State College*.
2. History of Virginia. Prog. Matthew Page Andrews, Baltimore.
3. The Southern colonies in the seventeenth century, 1607-1689. Prog. 350 pp. 2 yrs. Wesley F. Craven, *New York*.
4. The Southern colonies in the eighteenth century, 1689-1763. Prog. 350 pp. 2 yrs. Philip Davidson, *Agnes Scott*.

5. A history of Tennessee. Prog. 600 pp. 2 yrs. Stanley J. Folmsbee, *Tennessee*.
6. The South in the American Revolution, 1763-1789. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. Philip M. Hamer, *The National Archives*.
7. Founding the Southern system, 1789-1819. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. Thomas P. Abernethy, *Virginia*.
8. The development of Southern sectionalism, 1819-1848. Prog. 350 pp. 2 yrs. Charles S. Sydnor, *Duke*.
9. The coming of the War between the States. Prog. 450 pp. 2 mos. Avery Craven, *Chicago*.
10. The growth of Southern nationalism, 1848-1861. Prog. 350 pp. 4 yrs. *Id.*
11. The Southern Confederacy, 1861-1865. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. Charles W. Ramsdell, *Texas*.
12. Augusta, a city of the Confederacy. Prog. 200 pp. 2 yrs. William M. Robinson, Jr., *Augusta, Ga.*
13. The Confederacy and its aftermath as seen in judicial cases. Prog. 600 pp. 3 yrs. *Id.*
14. The South in Reconstruction, 1865-1880. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. E. Merton Coulter, *Georgia*.
15. The origins of the New South, 1880-1913. Prog. 350 pp. 3 yrs. C. Vann Woodward, *Florida*.
16. The present South, 1913-1940. Prog. 350 pp. 4 yrs. Rupert Vance, *North Carolina*.

COLONIAL AND REVOLUTIONARY

(See also Nos. 3, 4, 6, 19, 40, 42)

17. The Royal colony of British West Florida. Prog. 300 pp. 6 mos. C. N. Howard, *California at Los Angeles*.
18. An analysis of democratic tendencies in the American states, 1775-1787. Prog. 500 pp. 4 yrs. Justin Williams, *State Teachers College, River Falls, Wis.*

POLITICAL

(See also Nos. 1, 12, 18, 33, 36, 37, 42, 49, 54, 57, 61)

19. Federal relations of Virginia, 1774-1789. Prog. Diss. L. W. Seegers, *Pennsylvania*.
20. Expansion of South Carolina, 1729-1765. Prog. 350 pp. 1 yr. Diss. (*Columbia*) R. L. Meriwether, *South Carolina*.
21. Sectionalism and internal improvements in Tennessee prior to 1840. Prin. Stanley J. Folmsbee, *Tennessee*.

22. The Southeastern frontier, 1800-1850. Prog. 1 yr. A. J. Hanna, *Rollins*.
23. Movements for secession in East Tennessee. Con. H. L. Swint, *Vanderbilt*.
24. The Know-Nothings in Virginia. Prog. Diss. L. J. Darter, *Pennsylvania*.
25. Economic forces in the Republican party. Fin. 300 pp. Diss. Madison Kuhn, *Chicago*.
26. Antislavery factors in the Republican party. Fin. 300 pp. Diss. Helen Cavanaugh, *Chicago*.
27. The secession movement in Tennessee, 1847-1861. Prog. 30 pp. 1 yr. Mary R. Campbell, *Maryville, Tenn.*
28. Tennessee and the Union, 1847-1861. Prog. 250 pp. 2 yrs. *Id.*
29. Attitude of the Republican party in the secession crisis of 1860-1861. Prog. 250 pp. 1 yr. Diss. (*Yale*) David M. Potter, Jr., *Rice*.
30. President Grant's attitude toward the South. Fin. Diss. Mrs. Bell Montgomery Tilghman, *Columbia*.
31. Disposition of Confederate property in England after the war. Prog. Diss. Carvel Painter, *Harvard*.
32. A life of John Jacobus Flournoy. Prog. 200 pp. 1 yr. E. Merton Coulter, *Georgia*.
33. Madame Le Vert: toast of Southern statesmen. Prog. 300 pp. 3 yrs. Rena Mazyck Andrews, *Huntingdon*.
34. Colonel Charles Pollard: Southern gentleman and railroad builder. Prog. 250 pp. 2 yrs. *Id.*
35. A life of Raphael Semmes. Prog. Alfred H. Bill, *Princeton*.
36. Governor Hugh S. Thompson, 1865-1900. Prog. 150 pp. 3 yrs. Diss. A. R. Childs, *South Carolina*.
37. John Sharp Williams, planter statesman of the Lower South. Fin. 600 pp. George C. Osborn, *Berry*.

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND CULTURAL

(See also Nos. 1, 12, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 32, 33, 34, 56, 57, 61)

38. The Natchez Trace. Prog. 200 pp. 6 mos. Randle B. Truett, National Park Service.
39. The Natchez Trace; a historical survey. Fin. 250 pp. *Id.*, Ruth Butler, and O. T. Hagen, National Park Service.
40. Taxation in the province of South Carolina. Prog. 1 yr. Diss. C. L. Epting, *South Carolina*.
41. Ante-bellum inns and taverns in the South. Prog. 1,000 pp. Randle B. Truett, National Park Service.

42. South Carolina during the Confederation period, 1781-1789. Prog. Diss. C. Gregg Singer, *Pennsylvania*.
43. Economic history of Tennessee. Prog. 300 pp. Claude A. Campbell, *Maryville*, and Mary R. Campbell, Maryville, Tenn.
44. The Bank of the State of South Carolina. Prog. 150 pp. 2 yrs. Diss. J. M. Lesesne, *South Carolina*.
45. History of Alabama public health movement. Prog. 300 pp. 18 mos. Carey V. Stabler, *Duke*.
46. A social and economic history of New Orleans, 1803-1860. Prog. 400 pp. 3 yrs. Howard P. Johnson, *Tulane*.
47. Branch banking in Tennessee. Fin. 25 pp. Claude A. Campbell, *Maryville*.
48. The Cotton Kingdom in Alabama: a study of the ante-bellum plantation system. Prin. 250 pp. Charles S. Davis, *Alabama Polytechnic*.
49. History of the Southwestern oil industry. Prog. 400 pp. 1 yr. Gerald Forbes, *Northeastern (Okla.) State College*.
50. The secession movement in Georgia, 1852-1861. Fin. 400 pp. Diss. (*Duke*) George V. Irons, *Howard*.
51. The power to fight—problems of the Confederacy. Fin. 250 pp. James L. Sellers, *Nebraska*.
52. Economic history of the Confederate states. Prog. 400 pp. 5 yrs. William M. Robinson, Jr., *Augusta, Ga.*
53. The Northern teacher in the South, 1860-1876. Prog. H. L. Swint, *Vanderbilt*.
54. Development of corporations in Tennessee, 1865-1875. Prog. 25 pp. 1 yr. Claude A. Campbell, *Maryville*.
55. Federal-state aid to agriculture in Alabama, 1900-1939. Con. 3 yrs. Charles S. Davis, *Alabama Polytechnic*.

EDUCATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS

56. History of the Church of England in British East and West Florida. Prog. 6 mos. Edgar L. Pennington, Miami, Fla.

DIPLOMATIC AND LEGAL

(See also Nos. 13, 31)

57. Criminal justice on the Kentucky frontier. Prog. Diss. A. Paul Gratiot, *Pennsylvania*.
58. Diplomatic missions of the United States to Cuba to secure the Spanish archives of Florida. Prin. A. J. Hanna, *Rollins*.

59. The celebrated case of the slave-ship *Wanderer*. Prog. 100 pp. 2 yrs. William M. Robinson, Jr., Augusta, Ga.
60. Justice-in-Grey: a history of the legal system in the Confederate States. Prin. 700 pp. *Id.*
61. The judicial machinery in North Carolina during Reconstruction. Prog. Diss. Kenneth St. Clair, *Ohio State*.
62. The New Orleans Mafia incident of 1891. Prog. J. Alexander Karlin, *Minnesota*.

MILITARY AND NAVAL

(See also Nos. 35, 38, 39)

63. History of the Confederate States' navy. Prog. 400 pp. 5 yrs. William M. Robinson, Jr., Augusta, Ga.
64. New Orleans under General Butler. Fin. Diss. (*Yale*), Howard P. Johnson, *Tulane*.

DOCUMENTS, COMPILATIONS, ETC.

65. A guide to the manuscript collections of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History. Prog. 600 pp. 2 yrs. William D. McCain, Mississippi Department of Archives and History.
66. A checklist of Mississippi government publications. Prog. 200 pp. 2 yrs. *Id.*
67. A checklist of Mississippi newspapers in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History. Prog. 500 pp. 1 yr. *Id.*
68. Manuscript sources for the history of Oklahoma. Prog. James W. Moffitt, Oklahoma Historical Society.
69. Selected speeches of John Sharp Williams. Fin. 600 pp. George C. Osborn, *Berry*.
70. Selected correspondence of Woodrow Wilson and John Sharp Williams. Fin. 400 pp. *Id.*
71. Social science maps of Tennessee. Prog. 4 yrs. Stanley J. Folmsbee and Clyde Amick, *Tennessee*.

INDEX

- | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Abernethy, Thomas P., 7. | Campbell, Claude A., 43, 47, 54. |
| Amick, Clyde, 71. | Campbell, Mary R., 27, 28, 43. |
| Andrews, Matthew Page, 2. | Childs, A. R., 36. |
| Andrews, Rena Mazyck, 33, 34. | Cavanaugh, Helen, 26. |
| Bill, Alfred H., 35. | Coulter, E. Merton, 14, 32. |
| Butler, Ruth, 39. | Craven, Avery, 9, 10. |

- Craven, Wesley F., 3.
Darter, L. J., 24.
Davidson, Philip, 4.
Davis, Charles S., 48, 55.
Epting, C. L., 40.
Folmsbee, Stanley J., 5, 21, 71.
Forbes, Gerald, 1, 49.
Gratiot, A. Paul, 57.
Hagen, O. T., 39.
Hamer, Philip M., 6.
Hanna, A. J., 22, 58.
Howard, C. N., 17.
Irons, George V., 50.
Johnson, Howard P., 46, 64.
Karlin, J. Alexander, 62.
Kuhn, Madison, 25.
Lesesne, J. M., 44.
McCain, William D., 65, 66, 67.
Meriwether, R. L., 20.
Moffitt, James W., 68.
Osborn, George C., 37, 69, 70.
Painter, Carvel, 31.
Pennington, Edgar L., 56.
Potter, David M., Jr., 29.
Ramsdell, Charles W., 11.
Robinson, William M., Jr., 12, 13, 52,
 59, 60, 63.
St. Clair, Kenneth, 61.
Seegers, L. W., 19.
Sellers, James L., 51.
Singer, C. Gregg, 42.
Stabler, Carey V., 45.
Swint, H. L., 23, 53.
Sydnor, Charles S., 8.
Tilghman, Mrs. Bell Montgomery, 30.
Truett, Randle B., 38, 39, 41.
Vance, Rupert, 16.
Williams, Justin, 18.
Woodward, C. Vann, 15.

CONTRIBUTORS

EDWIN ADAMS DAVIS is director of the Department of Archives and assistant professor of history at Louisiana State University.

THOMAS P. GOVAN is professor of history at the University of the South.

ROBERT DOUTHAT MEADE is professor of history at Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

FRANK J. KLINGBERG is professor of history at the University of California, Los Angeles.

WILLIAM DIAMOND is a graduate student in the department of history at Johns Hopkins University.

DAVID R. BARBEE is a journalist and historical investigator, Washington, D. C.

MILLEDGE L. BONHAM, JR., is professor of history at Hamilton College.

The Pacific Historical Review

A Scholarly Journal Devoted to the Entire Pacific Area

Official organ of the

PACIFIC COAST BRANCH OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ, MANAGING EDITOR

JOHN W. CAUGHEY, ASSOCIATE EDITOR

321 Administration Building, University of California at Los Angeles

BOARD OF EDITORS: Thomas A. Bailey, Dan E. Clark, W. Henry Cooke,
Charles B. Fahs, Frederic L. Paxson, Walter N. Sage

Its current and back numbers contain a wealth of material on Australia and the Pacific islands, China and Japan, Alaska, the Canadian West, the American West, and the Pacific nations of Hispanic America.

EIGHTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION

\$4.00 PER YEAR

A sample copy will be sent on request

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

William and Mary College Quarterly

Devoted to the publication of original contributions and documents relating to Virginia history

\$1.00 A COPY.....\$4.00 A YEAR

THOROUGHLY INDEXED

Published Quarterly by
William and Mary College
at WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Editors

JOHN STEWART BRYAN
President of William and
Mary College

E. G. SWEM
Librarian, William and
Mary College

ANNOUNCING . . .

Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana

by

Roger Wallace Shugg

THIS STUDY undertakes to discover in the Old South the origins of the powerful class movements which resulted in the agrarian revolts of the nineties and in the more recent conflicts which have swept Louisiana and the rest of the South. The author has succeeded in isolating and examining as a class the white farmers and laborers of Louisiana during the crucial thirty-five-year period in which the issues of War and Reconstruction overshadowed all others. *xii, 372 pages. Cloth. Octavo. \$3.50.*

The Repressible Conflict 1830-1861

by

Avery O. Craven

THE TRADITIONAL issues over which the Civil War was fought are subjected to unsparing analysis in this book. The movement for abolition is interpreted as an economic crusade directed, not against the "peculiar institution" of slavery as it actually existed, but against slavery as the symbol of Southern agrarianism in conflict with Northern industrialism. *xii, 108 pages. Cloth. \$1.50.*

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University—o—Louisiana

The JOURNAL of POLITICS

*(A Quarterly Published by the
Southern Political Science Association)*

LEADING ARTICLES WHICH HAVE APPEARED IN THE FIRST FOUR NUMBERS INCLUDE:

- George H. Sabine, "What Is a Political Theory?"
E. S. Corwin, "The President as Administrative Chief."
J. T. Salter, "The Pattern of Politics."
Francis G. Wilson, "Political Suppression in the Modern State."
Carl B. Swisher, "The Supreme Court in Transition."
Max A. Shepard, "An Analysis of Analytical Jurisprudence."
William Ebenstein, "The Fate of Co-operation under Fascism."

AMONG MATERIALS ON THE SOUTH ARE THE FOLLOWING:

- J. B. Shannon, "Presidential Politics in the South"; Lee S. Greene, "Personnel Administration in the Tennessee Valley Authority"; Weldon Cooper, "The State Police Movement in the South."

Public administration has received attention in the above articles and other contributions.

In each issue a bibliographical article has appeared, each one reviewing recent developments in a certain field. Articles have been written by C. S. Hyneman, Taylor Cole and C. W. Smith, Jr. Regular book reviews are likewise published.

Subscription is \$3.00 per year (\$1.50 for students in residence). Mail to
**MANNING J. DAUER, MANAGING EDITOR, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA,
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA.**

Manuscripts should be sent with return stamped envelope to
**ROBERT J. HARRIS, EDITOR, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
UNIVERSITY, LOUISIANA.**

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University

VICE-PRESIDENT

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University

SECRETARY-TREASURER

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL, University of Texas (1939)

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY, University of Virginia (1940)

PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives (1941)

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

A. B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1939)

THOMAS S. STAPLES, Hendrix College (1939)

THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky (1940)

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of University of North Carolina (1940)

KATHRYN T. ABBEY, Florida State College for Women (1941)

AVERY O. CRAVEN, University of Chicago (1941)

The JOURNAL of SOUTHERN HISTORY

Board of Editors

JOHN D. BARNHART	WILLIAM O. LYNCH
CHARLES W. RAMSDELL	PHILIP DAVIDSON
AVERY O. CRAVEN	FRANK L. OWSLEY
WALTER B. POSEY	W. NEIL FRANKLIN

Managing Editor

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

Editorial Associate

FRED C. COLE

VOLUME V

FEBRUARY-NOVEMBER, 1939

Published Quarterly by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS OF VOLUME V

ARTICLES

<i>The Records of Southern History.</i> Philip M. Hamer	3
<i>Culture Versus Frontier in Tennessee, 1825-1850.</i> F. Garvin Davenport	18
<i>The People, William Goebel, and the Kentucky Railroads.</i> Thomas D. Clark	34
<i>New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction.</i> Francis B. Simkins	49
<i>The Fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association.</i> Philip Davidson	62
<i>Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.</i> Fletcher M. Green	76
<i>The Contribution of Walter Lynwood Fleming to Southern Scholarship.</i> William C. Binkley	143
<i>Southern Investments in Northern Lands before the Civil War.</i> Paul Wallace Gates	155
" <i>The First Northern Victory.</i> " Fred Harvey Harrington	186
<i>The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1856.</i> Harvey Wish	206
<i>The "Turner Theories" and the South.</i> Avery Craven	291
<i>The Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry.</i> Walter Prichard	315
<i>Cultural Factors in the History of the South.</i> Richard H. Shryock	333
<i>The American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform.</i> Theodore Saloutos	347
<i>Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas.</i> Edwin Adams Davis	431
<i>John M. Berrien and the Administration of Andrew Jackson.</i> Thomas P. Govan	447
<i>The Relations between Judah P. Benjamin and Jefferson Davis.</i> Robert Douthat Meade	468
<i>The Indian Frontier in South Carolina as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary.</i> Frank J. Klingberg	479
<i>Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist.</i> William Diamond	501

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

<i>The John Tobler Manuscripts: An Account of German-Swiss Emigrants in South Carolina, 1737.</i> Edited by Charles G. Cordle	83
<i>Cyrus Griffin's Plan of Reconciliation with the American Colonies.</i> Edited by Henry S. Rorer	98
<i>Slater Fund Beginnings: Letters from General Agent Atticus G. Haygood to Rutherford B. Hayes.</i> Edited by Curtis W. Garrison	223
<i>A Canadian View of Parties and Issues on the Eve of the Civil War.</i> Edited by James J. Talman	245

<i>Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the South.</i> Fred Landon.....	364
<i>Southern Designs on Cuba, 1854-1857, and Some European Opinions.</i> Edited by Gavin B. Henderson.....	371
<i>The Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas.</i> Edited by David R. Barbee and Milledge L. Bonham, Jr.....	527
CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIA- TION.....	81
BOOK REVIEWS.....	102, 254, 386, 553
HISTORICAL NEWS AND NOTICES.....	123, 275, 411, 573
COMMUNICATION.....	572
INDEX.....	587

INDEX

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME V

- Abbey, Kathryn T., mentioned, 68.
Abernethy, Thomas P., revs. Bodley's *Our First Great West*, 105-106; mentioned, 278.
Abolition, influence in 1855-56 speakership contest, 187 ff.; and slave insurrection panic, 206 ff.; Birney and, movement, 263-64; Nathaniel Ware's views on, 524-25; attacked by Douglas, 529 ff.; background for war, 553-54.
Acheson, Sam, *35,000 Days in Texas*, revd., 270-72.
Adams, George, "Med. Theory and Practice in the Confed.," synop., 70.
Adams, Herbert B., vol. of letters revd., 561-62.
Adams, James H., proposes reopening slave trade, 207.
Adams, John, and So. Indian policy, 448; mentioned, 452.
Adams, John Q., opinion of Berrien, 457.
Agrarians, Ky., and corporations, 35.
Agriculture, in col. S. C., 85 ff.; plantation, 109-110; Fleming lectures on, noted, 275; on So. Wests, 300 ff.; sugar, and Civil War, 315-32; Ger. and Eng. method compared, 343 ff.; on La. plantation, 431-46; and economic theory, 514 ff.
Aiken, William, land speculation, 166, 179; and 1855-56 speakership election, 190 ff.
Alabama, preservation of hist'l records, 6-7; archives law, 10; land speculation in, 156; slave insurrection panic, 218; Slater fund work in, 233 ff.; emigration to, 300 ff.; Negro educ., 404-405; and Indian question, 447; Montgomery address of Douglas, 527-52.
Alabama, Raphael Semmes and, 115-17.
Alabama, Univ. of, library acquisitions, 282.
Alabama: A Social and Economic History of the State, by Marie B. Owen, revd., 394.
Alabama Department of Archives and History, acquisitions, 127.
Alabama Historical Society, archival work, 10.
Alabama History Commission, preserves hist'l records, 10-11.
Alabama Platform, Douglas and, 541 ff.
Albert Kahn Foundation, U. B. Phillips and, 366-67.
Almanac, Tobler, pub. in S. C., 83.
Amelia, S. C., noted, 85.
American Book Company, issue in Ky. politics, 38 ff.
American Caste and the Negro College, by Buell G. Gallagher, revd., 273-74.
American Missionary Association, Negro educ. work, 240.
American Negro Slavery, U. B. Phillips', evaluated, 365.
American Philosophical Society, influence on Ware, 505-506.
"American Society of Equity in Kentucky: A Recent Attempt in Agrarian Reform," by Theodore Saloutos, 347-63.
American Tobacco Company, and Ky. tobacco industry, 347 ff.
Anderson, Charles, revs. Parks' *Segments of So. Thought*, 558-60.
Andreassen, John C. L., "Inventory of MS. Collections in the So.," synop., 66; mentioned, 415.
An Exposition of the Weakness and Inefficiency of the Government of the United States of North America, by Nathaniel Ware, discussed, 508 ff.
Annual meeting, fourth, rpt., 62-75.
"Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer," by Fletcher M. Green, 76-80.
Anthropology, and race theories, 337 ff.
Antimission Baptists, Tenn., 29 ff.
Apalachi, relig. work among, 480 ff.
Appenzellers, emigrants in S. C., 83-98.
Appleman, Roy E., "The Survey of Historic Sites in the So.," synop., 65.
Archives, So., conditions, 4 ff.; state, recommendation for organization, 15-16.
Arkansas, preservation of hist'l records, 7; slave insurrection panic, 216-17; emigration to, 301; Hist'l Records Survey work, 419.

- Arkansas, University of, library acquisitions, 130, 281.
- Arkansas Handbook, 1937-1938*, by Dallas T. Herndon, noted, 131.
- Arkansas History Commission, established, 11-12.
- Armstrong, Margaret, *Fanny Kemble*, revd., 110-12.
- Arnett, Alex M., mentioned, 277.
- Arnold, B. W., mentioned, 573.
- Art, frontier appreciation, 22.
- Arthur, Stanley C., mentioned, 76.
- Arrell, W. M., and Slater fund work, 241.
- Ashe, Samuel A'Court, death noted, 78, 125; memorial, 418.
- Askew, W. C., mentioned, 125, 413.
- Attakapas region, sugar planting in, 315 ff.
- Augusta, Ga., Ger.-Swiss emigrants near, 83 ff.
- Aycock, Charles B., mentioned, 50.
- Bache, Franklin, mentioned, 505.
- Bacon, Leonard W., and Slater fund, 224-25.
- Baker-Crothers, Hays, revs. *Kegley's Va. Frontier*, 103-104.
- Bank of the United States, fight against, 397-98; Berrien and, 447 ff.
- Banks, effect of Reconstruction on, 54; and land speculation, 163 ff.; and sugar industry, 319 ff.; ante-bellum, and La. agric., 433 ff.
- Banks, Nathaniel P., and 1855-56 speakership election, 186 ff.; and La. sugar industry, 320-21.
- Baptists, and Tenn. culture, 27 ff.; Truett and, 410.
- Barbee, David R. (co-ed.), "The Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas," 527-52.
- Barbour, James, and removal of Indians, 447.
- Barbour, Philip, nominated for vice-pres., 464.
- Barker, Eugene C. (co-ed.), *Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863*, revd., 259-61.
- Barnes, Gilbert H., mentioned, 365; revs. Griggs' *Thomas Clarkson*, 392-93.
- Barnes, Harry E., mentioned, 276.
- Barnhart, John D., revs. Kohlmeier's *Old Northwest*, 112-13.
- Barrow, Bennet H., as La. planter, 431-46.
- Barrow, William, II, mentioned, 432.
- Baton Rouge, sugar region, 315 ff.
- Bauerlein, George, mentioned, 574.
- Bayou Sara, La. entrepôt, 432.
- Beale, Howard K., mentioned, 78.
- Bean, R. Bennett, *Peopling of Va.*, revd., 257-58.
- Bean, W. G., mentioned, 126; revs. Dawson's *A French Regicide in Ala.*, 558.
- Beauregard, P. G. T., mentioned, 473.
- Beckner, Lucian, and tobacco farmers' organization, 353.
- Bell, John, views on frontier culture, 23-24; mentioned, 212.
- Bell-Everett party, and 1860 campaign, 247 ff.
- Belmont, August, and Ky. politics, 37, 40 ff.; land speculator, 173, 177.
- Benjamin, Judah P., influence in Confed. govt., 468-78.
- "Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas," by Edwin A. Davis, 431-46.
- Benton, Thomas H., mentioned, 197.
- Bermuda, hist. of, revd., 102-103.
- Berrien, John M., and the adm. of Jackson, 447-67.
- Berry, John, land speculator, 160.
- Berry, Joseph, land speculator, 160.
- Bettersworth, John K., mentioned, 279.
- Biddle, Nicholas, and Berrien, 450 ff.; mentioned, 505.
- Billington, Ray A., *Protestant Crusade*, revd., 266-67.
- Binkley, William C., paper on Walter L. Fleming, synop., 74; "Contribution of Walter Lynwood Fleming to So. Scholarship," 143-54; revs. Williams and Barker's (eds.) *Writings of Sam Houston*, 259-61.
- Biography of a River Town: Memphis, Its Heroic Age*, by Gerald M. Capers, Jr., revd., 554-55.
- Biological nature, as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
- Birney, James G., letters, revd., 263-64.
- Black Codes, and Reconstruction, 52-53.
- Black Folk, Then and Now: An Essay in the History and Sociology of the Negro Race*, by W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, revd., 564-65.
- Black Man in White America*, by John G. Van Deusen, revd., 565-66.
- Black Workers and the New Unions*, by Horace R. Cayton and George S. Mitchell, revd., 567-68.
- Blackburn, Joseph S. C., and Ky. politics, 38 ff.
- Blair, Francis P., and Eaton affair, 459 ff.
- Blanding, Abram, land speculator, 168.
- Blockade, No., effect on sugar industry, 318 ff.
- Boas, Franz, mentioned, 339.
- Bodley, Temple, *Our First Great West*, revd., 105-106.
- Bolton, Herbert E., *Wider Horizons of Am. Hist.*, revd., 563-64.
- Bonapartes in America*, by Clarence E. Macartney and Gordon Dorrance, revd., 557-58.

- Bond, Horace M., *Negro Educ. in Ala.*, revd., 404-405.
- Bonham, Milledge L., Jr. (co-ed.), "The Montgomery Address of Douglas," 527-52.
- Booth, John Wilkes, study of, revd., 401-402.
- Bouchereau, Alcée, sugar statistics, 328 ff.
- Bouchereau, Louis, sugar statistics, 328 ff.
- Bowers, Claude G., *Tragic Era*, interpretation noted, 49.
- Bowie, Thomas F., mentioned, 191, 205.
- Bowles, Samuel, views on 1855-56 speakership contest, 196.
- Boyce, William W., land speculator, 166, 179.
- Boyd, Minnie Clare, mentioned, 126.
- Boyd, W. K., death noted, 78; memorial vol. to, noted, 280.
- Boylan, Elaine (co-auth.), *A Handbook of Okla. Writers*, revd., 389-90.
- Boyle, Jeremiah T., land speculator, 170-71.
- Bradford, William, mentioned, 336.
- Bradley, William O., Ky. gov., 37 ff.
- Brahm, John G. W. de, description of Carolinas, 302.
- Bramlette, David C., mentioned, 78.
- Branch, John, in Jackson cabinet, 454 ff.
- Breckinridge, John C., and land speculations, 166, 179 ff.; campaign for pres., 247 ff.; appointed ambassador to Spain, 380; Douglas' views conc., 540 ff.
- Breckinridge, Robert J., land speculator, 178.
- Breckinridge, W. C. P., and Ky. politics, 1898, pp. 39 ff.
- Brent, Thomas L. L., land speculator, 169-70.
- Bright, Jesse, land speculator, 164, 166.
- British-American Tobacco Company, and monopoly fight, 347 ff.
- Bronston, Charles, mentioned, 39; Ky. textbook bill, 41.
- Brooke, Henry L., invests in No. lands, 157-58.
- Brooks, Preston S., mentioned, 190, 191, 205; assault on Sumner, 206.
- Brown, Albert G., and frontier dem., 308-309; supports homestead bills, 312.
- Brown, John P., *Old Frontiers*, revd., 107-108.
- Brown, John Y., Ky. gov., 36-40.
- Buchanan, James, adm. policy, 173, 174, 176; part in Ostend Manifesto, 373 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 540 ff.
- Buck, Solon J., mentioned, 125.
- Buckle, Henry T., and geographical determinism, 339.
- Buffington, James, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 195.
- Buford, Jefferson, land speculator, 172-73.
- "Buford Expedition to Kansas," by W. L. Fleming, noted, 149.
- Bull, William, S. P. G. missionary, 493 ff.
- Bullock, Helen, *Williamsburg Art of Cookery*, noted, 280.
- Bullock, Rufus B., recommended for cabinet, 243.
- Bunch, Robert, British consul, 209.
- Burgess, John W., on the Negro, 58; mentioned, 145.
- Burley Tobacco Society, organized, 353; activity, 354 ff.
- Burlingame, Anson, and the 1855-56 speakership contest, 191 ff.
- Burne, Alfred H., *Lee, Grant and Sherman*, revd., 400-401.
- Burns, Edward M., *James Madison*, revd., 258-59.
- Butler, Pierce, husband of Fanny Kemble, 111.
- Cabell, Landon R., invests in No. lands, 157-58.
- Caldwell and Company: A Southern Financial Empire*, by John B. McFerrin, revd., 570-71.
- Caldwell, John, mentioned, 24.
- Caldwell, Wallace E., mentioned, 77.
- Calhoun, John C., and N. C. hist., 1824, pp. 396-97; and Jackson adm., 447 ff.; and slavery question, 534.
- California, Douglas and, statehood, 534-35.
- Callaway, Morgan, and Negro educ., 226.
- Callcott, Wilfred H., mentioned, 125, 276.
- Calloway, James, land speculator, 177.
- Calvinistic doctrine, conflict with frontier philosophy, 27 ff.
- Cambreleng, Churchill C., Van Buren partisan, 452-53.
- Campbell, Alexander, influence on frontier culture, 31-33.
- Campbell, Doak S., mentioned, 415.
- Campbell, John, and racial theories, 339.
- Campbell, Lewis D., candidate for speakership, 190 ff.
- Campbell, Mary R. (Mrs.), mentioned, 124.
- Canada, interest in So. hist., 364-65.
- Capers, Gerald M., Jr., mentioned, 70; *Biog. of a River Town*, revd., 554-55.
- Capital, So., invested in No. lands, 155-85.
- Cappon, Lester J., rpts. on Va. hist'l agencies, 73.
- Carey, Henry C., nat. economist, 501 ff.
- Carey, Mathew, nat. economist, 501 ff.
- Carlisle, John G., and Goebel, 36-37.
- Carpetbaggers, new viewpoints on, 49 ff.; and La. labor, 330.
- Carrington, George, land speculator, 163.
- Carroll, H. Bailey, revs. Acheson's *35,000 Days in Texas*, 270-72.
- Carroll, Joseph C., *Slave Insurrections in the U. S.*, revd., 265-66.

- Carter, Clarence E. (comp. & ed.), *Territorial Papers of U. S.*, VI, revd., 108-109.
- Carter Glass: Unreconstructed Rebel*, by James E. Palmer, revd., 408-409.
- Caskey, Willie M., *Secession and Restoration of La.*, revd., 268-69.
- Catholic church, enmity toward, in U. S., 266-67; attitude of S. P. G. toward, 486, 499-500.
- Caughey, John W., *McGillivray of the Creeks*, revd., 106-107.
- Cayton, Horace R. (co-auth.), *Black Workers and the New Unions*, revd., 567-68.
- Census, Seventh, De Bow and, 73-74.
- Chaffee, Calvin C., mentioned, 191.
- Chamberlayne, John, Indian commissioner, 490 ff.
- Champomier, P. A., sugar statistics, 316 ff.
- Chase, Joshua C., mentioned, 573.
- Chase, Salmon P., mentioned, 197.
- Chattanooga, Univ. of, library acquisitions, 281.
- Chemicals, lack of, effect on sugar industry, 318 ff.
- Cherokee, hist. of, 107-108; removal and Jackson adm., 448 ff.; relig. work among, 480 ff.
- Cheves, Langdon, mentioned, 463.
- Chickasaw, relig. work among, 480 ff.
- Child Labor Legislation in the Southern Textile States*, by Elizabeth H. Davidson, revd., 407-408.
- Chinn, Jack, mentioned, 34; trouble with Bronston, 41-42.
- Christian Baptist*, Campbell's, and educ., 31.
- Chumbley, George L., *Col. Justice in Va.*, revd., 255-57.
- Church-State Relationships in Education in North Carolina Since 1776*, by Luther L. Goebel, revd., 272-73.
- Civil War, Fleming's writings on, 146 ff.; effect on land speculations, 158 ff.; causes, a Canadian view, 247 ff.; background as shown by Douglas, 529-52; a represible conflict, 553-54.
- Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, by W. L. Fleming, appraised, 146-47, 150.
- Clarendon, Lord, and Cuban question, 371 ff.
- Clark, Blanche H., mentioned, 573.
- Clark, Dan E., views on So. economy, 310.
- Clark, George Rogers, and Rev. War, 105-106.
- Clark, John B., revs. Owen's *Ala.*, 394.
- Clark, Thomas D., "The People, William Goebel, and the Ky. R. Rs.," 34-48; *Rampaging Frontier*, revd., 398-99; mentioned, 412, 573.
- Clarke, Charles, Canadian legislator, 245-46.
- Clarke [Clark], John, and Ga. politics, 451 ff.
- Clarke [Clark] party, and Jackson adm., 451 ff.
- Clarkson, Thomas, biog., revd., 392-93.
- Clay, Clement, supports homestead bills, 312.
- Clay, Henry, and Bank fight, 397-98; influence on Ware, 512 ff.
- Clayton, Augustine S., mentioned, 463.
- Clingman, Thomas, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 190 ff.
- Clinton, DeWitt, mentioned, 505.
- Cloud, N. B., mentioned, 63.
- Cobb, Howell, leader in 1855-56 speakership contest, 189 ff.; mentioned, 549.
- Cobb, W. R. W., land speculator, 173; supports homestead bills, 312.
- Coker, Francis W., mentioned, 414.
- Cole, Fred C., mentioned, 74, 128; "Research Projects in So. Hist.," 581-86.
- Coleman, J. Winston, Jr., *Lexington during the Civil War*, noted, 131.
- Colfax, Schuyler, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 191 ff.
- Colleges, frontier, 18 ff.
- Colonial Justice in Virginia: The Development of a Judicial System, Typical Laws and Cases of the Period*, by George L. Chumbley, revd., 255-57.
- Colonial Records of North Carolina*, pioneer publ., 10.
- Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., research activity, 418.
- Colonialism, as hist'l determinant, 334 ff.
- Colson, D. G., and Ky. politics, 46.
- Cometti, Elizabeth, mentioned, 412.
- Compromise of 1850, Douglas views conc., 535 ff.
- Concha, Jose de la, and Quitman filibuster, 381-82.
- Confederacy, a Canadian view, 252-53; break-up and flight of officers, 269-70; division in, and Turner theory, 314; relations of Jefferson and Benjamin and, 468-78.
- Confiscation, land, Civil War and, 181 ff.
- Connor, R. D. W., first secy. of N. C. hist'l commission, 12.
- Conservation, soil, in ante-bellum S. C., 71.
- Constitution, U. S., proposed changes, 121-22; interpreted by Douglas, 529 ff.
- "Constitution and By-Laws of the Southern Historical Association," 81-82.
- Continental Congress, plan for reconciliation with Eng. and, 99-100.
- "Contribution of Walter Lynwood Fleming to Southern Scholarship," by William C. Binkley, 143-54.

- Cantrill, J. Campbell, leader in tobacco organization, 353 ff.
- Cooke, Jay, promoter of Duluth, 166.
- Coolies, plan to import, to La., 327.
- "Copperheads," and Turner thesis, 314.
- Corcoran, William W., land speculator, 164 ff.
- Cordle, Charles G. (ed.), "The John Tobler MSS.: An Account of Ger.-Swiss Emigrants in S. C., 1737," 83-98.
- Corporations, fight against, in Ky., 37 ff.; and Ky. tobacco industry, 347 ff.
- Cotterill, R. S., revs. Caughey's *McGillivray of the Creeks*, 106-107; revs. Sonne's *Liberal Ky.*, 393-94; *Short Hist. of the Americas*, noted, 575.
- Cotton, kingdom, and Turner thesis, 299 ff.; culture, sugar substituted for, 315 ff.; plantation staple, 434 ff.; source of credit for Confed., 471 ff.; trade in, with Eng. advocated, 506.
- Coulter, E. Merton, address noted, 68; (col. and ed.), *Other Half of Old New Orleans*, revd., 264-65; mentioned, 278, 574; revs. Macartney and Dorrance's *Bonapartes in Am.*, 557-58.
- Covington, W. A., *Hist. of Colquitt County*, noted, 130-31.
- Covode, John, mentioned, 191.
- Craven, Avery, "'Turner Theories' and the So.," 65, 291-314; mentioned, 278; *Repressible Conflict*, revd., 553-54.
- Craven, Braxton, and Trinity College, 405-406.
- Craven, Wesley F., *Intro. to the Hist. of Bermuda*, revd., 102-103; revs. Semmes' *Crime and Punishment in Early Md.*, 255-57; revs. Chumbley's *Col. Justice in Va.*, 255-57; mentioned, 278; revs. Forman's *Jamestown and St. Mary's*, 390-92.
- Crawford, Joel, mentioned, 453.
- Crawford, William H., and 1824 election, 396-97; and Berrien, 451 ff.
- Credit system, ante-bellum La., and planting, 433 ff.
- Creek, McGillivray and, 106-107; removal and Jackson adm., 448 ff.; S. P. G. work among, 480 ff.
- Crime and Punishment in Early Maryland*, by Raphael Semmes, revd., 255-57.
- Crimean War, Anglo-Am. relations and, 371 ff.
- Crittenden, C. C., mentioned, 72, 280.
- Crowell, John F., *Personal Recollections*, revd., 405-407.
- Cuba, annexation of, and U. S. diplomatic relations, 371 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 543-44, 550-51.
- Cullen, Elisha D., mentioned, 191.
- "Cultural Factors in the History of the South," by Richard H. Shryock, 333-46.
- "Culture Versus Frontier in Tennessee, 1825-1850," by F. Garvin Davenport, 18-33.
- Cumberland College, and Tenn. frontier, 19, 22; becomes Univ. of Nashville, 23.
- Cumming, W. P., mentioned, 574.
- Curry, J. L. M., Peabody fund gen. agent, 224 ff.
- Curti, Merle E., mentioned, 275.
- Cushing, Caleb, and Cuban annexation, 377.
- "Cyrus Griffin's Plan of Reconciliation with the American Colonies," ed. by Henry S. Rorer, 98-101.
- Dabney, Thomas, migration to Miss., 304; and frontier democracy, 308.
- Dale, Edward E., revs. Coulter's (ed.), *Other Half of Old New Orleans*, 264-65; mentioned, 414.
- Dallas Historical Society, acquisitions, 130.
- Dallas News, hist., 270-72.
- Danforth, James B., speculator in No. lands, 159-60, 179.
- Dark Tobacco Association, and tobacco wars, 358 ff.
- Dartmouth, Earl of, and Griffin peace plan, 98 ff.
- Darwinian theory, and social theories, 338.
- Dauer, Manning J., mentioned, 280.
- Davenport, F. Garvin, "Culture vs. Frontier in Tenn.," 18-33; revs. Windrow's *John Berrien Lindsley*, 261-62.
- Davidson, Elizabeth H., *Child Labor Legislation*, revd., 407-408.
- Davidson, Philip, "The Fourth Ann. Meeting of the So. Hist'l Assoc.," 62-75; revs. Spruill's *Women's Life and Work in the So. Cols.*, 254-55; mentioned, 278.
- Davis, Edwin A., revs. Hanna's *Flight into Oblivion*, 269-70; "Bennet H. Barrow, Ante-Bellum Planter of the Felicianas," 431-46.
- Davis, Henry W., and 1855-56 speakership election, 190 ff.
- Davis, Jefferson, Fleming's proposed study of, 151-52; mentioned, 246, 313, 540; and Cuban annexation, 377; relations with Benjamin, 468-78; criticized by Douglas, 537.
- Davis, Mrs. Jefferson, influence with husband, 468; and Benjamin, 473-74.
- Davis, Reuben, frontier creed of, 307; mentioned, 475.
- Davis, Timothy, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 195.
- Dawson, John C., *A French Regicide in Ala.*, revd., 558.
- Day, Timothy C., views on 1855-56 speakership contest, 189.
- Deas, Maj. George, land purchase, 166.

- De Bow, J. D. B., and the Seventh Census, 73-74.
- De Bow's Review*, and sugar industry, 316 ff.
- Degelos, P. A., sugar reports, 316.
- Democracy, in Turner thesis, 295 ff.; as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
- Democracy in the Making: The Jackson-Tyler Era*, by Hugh R. Fraser, revd., 397-98.
- Democratic party, and Reconstruction, 51 ff.; 1860 campaign, 247 ff.; and 1855-56 speakership election, 187 ff.
- Dennett, Daniel, ed. of *Planters' Banner*, 323.
- Desmont, I., and Barrow, 435.
- Determinants, hist'l, evaluation of, 333 ff.
- Diamond, William, "Nathaniel A. Ware, Nat. Economist," 501-26.
- Documentary History of Reconstruction*, by W. L. Fleming, appraised, 147, 148-49, 150.
- Dodd, William E., mentioned, 125.
- Donelson, Andrew Jackson, mentioned, 459.
- Doolittle, James R., and land speculations, 182.
- Dorrance, Gordon (co-auth.), *Bonapartes in Am.*, revd., 557-58.
- Douglas, Stephen A., and land speculations, 164, 166; influence in 1855-56 speakership election, 186 ff.; Montgomery address, 527-52.
- Douglass, Frederick, favors slave insurrection, 221.
- Downs, Robert B. (ed.), *Resources of So. Libraries*, noted, 130.
- Drake, Julia A. (co-auth.), *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare*, revd., 556-57.
- Drayton, William, mentioned, 451.
- Dred Scott case, and slave insurrections, 206.
- Driver, Carl, mentioned, 153.
- Driver, Leota S., revs. Armstrong's *Fanny Kemble*, 110-12.
- Du Bois, W. E. B., and Reconstruction hist., 52; *Black Folk*, revd., 564-65.
- Duke, Basil W., lobbyist for L. and N. R. R., 40.
- Dulany, Martin R., work on Negro hist., 59.
- Dumond, Dwight L., mentioned, 124; (ed.), *Letters of James G. Birney*, revd., 263-64.
- Duncan, Dr. Stephen, land speculator, 178.
- Duniway, David C., revs. Kohn and Glenn's (eds.) *Internal Improvement in S. C.*, 395-96.
- Dunning, William A., on the Negro, 59; influence on Fleming, 145.
- Dunton, L. M., pres. of Claflin Univ., 240.
- Dupre, John H., mentioned, 276, 412.
- Dykstra, Charles, mentioned, 574.
- Early Description of Middle Tennessee*, by E. Bushnell, ed. by Douglas C. McMurtrie, noted, 418.
- Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*, comp. by Everett E. Edwards, revd., 387-89.
- Easley, Daniel B., land speculator, 163.
- Easley, James S., land speculator, 161-63, 179, 180.
- Easley and Willingham, land speculators, 161-63.
- East Tennessee Historical Society, ann. banquet, noted, 127; ann. meeting, noted, 277; to publ. studies, 281.
- Eaton, Clement, wins Duke Press prize, 275.
- Eaton, John H., and Jackson adm., 448 ff.
- Eaton Affair, and Jackson cabinet, 455 ff.
- Eckenrode, H. J., mentioned, 471.
- Economic development, as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
- Education, frontier, in early Tenn., 19 ff.; Negro, Slater fund work, 223-45; church-state relations in, 272-73; in Ware's writings, 520 ff.
- Edwards, Everett E., "The So. Plantation," noted, 63; mentioned, 276; (comp.), *Early Writings of Frederick J. Turner*, revd., 387-89; bibliog. compilations, noted, 575-76.
- "Effects of the Civil War on the Louisiana Sugar Industry," by Walter Prichard, 315-32.
- Election laws, Ky., 38 ff.
- Eliot, Thomas D., and So. land speculators, 182.
- Ellis, Elmer, mentioned, 413.
- Ellison, William H., revs. Stern's *Man Who Killed Lincoln*, 401-402.
- Ellsworth, Henry L., land speculator, 157.
- Elmore, Rush, land speculator, 172.
- Ely, Richard T., collection, acquired by L. S. U., 129.
- Emigrants, Ger.-Swiss, in S. C., 83-97; in La., 325 ff.
- English, views of American culture, 334 ff.; in U. S., 341-44; attitude toward U. S. annexation of Cuba, 371 ff.; diplomatic relations with U. S., 372 ff.; and Confed., 471 ff.
- English, William H., mentioned, 190.
- Equity, Soc. of, in Ky., 347-63.
- Evans, Mona, mentioned, 413.
- Evarts, William M., Peabody Trustee, 224.
- Everett, Edward, mentioned, 505.
- Ewing, Felix G., and tobacco planters organization, 351 ff.
- Ewing, Thomas, and land speculations, 169.
- Ewing, Thomas, Jr., land agent, 164.
- Factors, and La. sugar industry, 319.

- Fanny Kemble: *A Passionate Victorian*, by Margaret Armstrong, revd., 110-12.
- Fanshawe, Arthur, and Cuban question, 380-81.
- Fant, E. L., land speculator, 164, 179.
- Farish, Hunter D., mentioned, 124.
- Felicianas, planting and soc. life, 431-46.
- Ferguson, McDougal, mentioned, 47.
- Fertilizer, use of, in Reconstruction period, 54; ante-bellum use, 71; commercial use in sugar planting, 328; use on La. plantation, 437-38.
- Ficklin, Orlando B., land purchases, 166.
- Filson Club, newspaper acquisitions, 420.
- Finley, Robert, mentioned, 18.
- Finley and Company, N. O. factors, 434.
- "First Northern Victory," by Fred H. Harrington, 186-205.
- Fitzhugh, George, biog., noted, 279.
- Fleming, Walter L., contribution to So. scholarship, 74, 143-54.
- Fleming Lectures, third series, noted, 175; second series, revd., 533-34.
- Flight into Oblivion*, by A. J. Hanna, revd., 269-70.
- Florida, preservation of hist'l records, 8; lacks archival agency, 13; slave insurrection plots, 218.
- Florida Historical Society, meetings noted, 126-27, 277-78, 416-17.
- Flournoy, L. M., land speculator, 171.
- Floyd, John B., land speculator, 175.
- Foerster, Norman, mentioned, 275.
- Folmsbee, Stanley J., mentioned, 281.
- Fordyce, John, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
- Forman, Henry C., *Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance*, revd., 390-92.
- Forney, John, and land speculation, 164-166.
- Forsyth, John, and Ga. politics, 453.
- Fort Sumter, a Canadian view of attack on, 253.
- Fortier, James J. A., mentioned, 72.
- Forty Acres and Steel Mules*, by Herman C. Nixon, revd., 568-70.
- "Fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association," by Philip Davidson, 62-75.
- Fowler, Harold L., mentioned, 125.
- France, alliance with Eng. and Cuban question, 371 ff.
- Franklin, "Bob," and "Music Hall" convention, 42.
- Franklin, Isaac, study of, revd., 109-110.
- Franklin, W. Neil, elected to board of eds., 77; revs. Brown's *Old Frontiers*, 107-108.
- Fraser, Hugh R., *Democracy in the Making*, revd., 397-98.
- Free Soilers, and 1855-56 speakership election, 187 ff.
- Freedmen, Fleming's writings about, 149 ff. See also Negro.
- Freedmen's Aid Society, school in Tenn., 235; in La., 237.
- Freedmen's Bureau, and Reconstruction, 52-53; and La. sugar industry, 323 ff.
- Freeman, Douglas S., gives Dancy Foundation Lectures, 415.
- Freeport Doctrine, Douglas' interpretation of, 549.
- Frémont, John C., nomination viewed with alarm, 207.
- French Regicide in Alabama, 1824-1837*, by John C. Dawson, revd., 558.
- French Revolution, hist., compared with Reconstruction, 51.
- From Mill Wheel to Plowshare: The Story of the Contribution of the Christian Orndorff Family to the Social and Industrial History of the U. S.*, by Julia Angeline Drake and James R. Orndorff, revd., 556-57.
- Frontier, culture vs., in Tenn., 18-33; Turner thesis of, discussed, 65-66, 291-314, 563; manners and humors, 398-99; S. C., religious work, 480 ff.
- Fugitive Slave law, issue in 1855-56 speakership contest, 199 ff.; Douglas' attitude toward, 531 ff.
- Fuller, Henry M., and 1855-56 speakership contest, 190 ff.
- "Future Regions of the United States," by Harry E. Moore, synop., 69-70.
- Gabriel, slave insurrection leader, 206.
- Gaines, John W., supports farmers' organization, 352.
- Gallagher, Buell G., *Am. Caste and the Negro College*, revd., 273-74.
- Gallatin, Albert, mentioned, 463.
- Garden, Alexander, S. P. G. missionary, 498.
- Gardner, Malcolm E., "The Natchez Trace as an Historic Site Problem," synop., 64-65.
- Garner, Alfred W., mentioned, 279.
- Garrison, Curtis W., mentioned, 279, 415; "Slater Fund Beginnings," 223-45; revs. Bond's *Negro Educ. in Ala.*, 404-405.
- Garrison, William L., and 1855-56 speakership contest, 205; Phillips' opinion of, 366.
- Gates, Paul W., "So. Investments in No. Lands before the Civil War," 155-85.
- General W. T. Sherman as College President*, by W. L. Fleming, noted, 150.
- Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region: Benjamin L. C. Wailes*, by Charles S. Sydnor, revd., 114-15.
- Geography, and regionalism, 69-70; as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
- Geology, theory and practice in So., 70-71.

- George Fitzhugh, Conservative of the Old South*, by Harvey Wish, noted, 279.
- George W. Truett*, by Powhatan W. James, revd., 410.
- Georgia, preservation of hist'l records, 7-8; Compiler of State Records, established, 12; slave insurrection plots, 218-19; Slater fund work in, 226 ff.; emigration from, 300 ff.; frontier life, 306; supports Jackson adm., 447 ff.
- Georgia Historical Society, centennial celebration, 416.
- German, element, and frontier development, 295, 298; immigration to La., 326; in U. S., 341-44.
- German-Swiss, S. C. emigrants, 83-98.
- Giddings, Franklin H., mentioned, 145.
- Giddings, Joshua, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 186 ff.
- Giessendanner, John, Ger.-Swiss emigrant to S. C., 86 ff.
- Gilbert, Dorothy L., *Guilford, A Quaker College*, noted, 575.
- Gillespie, J. C., mentioned, 39.
- Gilman, Daniel C., controversies with Haygood, 225 ff.; and Negro educ., 229-31.
- Gilmer, George R., and Jacksonian politics, 449 ff.
- Gilmore, John R., peace agent, 476.
- Glass, Carter, mentioned, 50; biog., revd., 408-409.
- Glassie, Henry H., mentioned, 78.
- Glenn, Bess (co-ed.), *Internal Improvement in S. C.*, revd., 395-96.
- Gobbel, Luther L., *Church-State Relationships in Educ. in N. C. Since 1776*, revd., 272-73.
- Gobineau, Arthur de, mentioned, 338.
- Godman, W. S., and Slater fund work, 241.
- Goebel, William, and Ky. R. Rs., 34-38; murdered, 34; campaign for gov., 34 ff.
- Goff, John H., mentioned, 414.
- Govan, Thomas P., "John M. Berrien and the Adm. of Andrew Jackson," 447-67; mentioned, 573.
- Government records, preservation, 5 ff.
- Grady, Henry W., mentioned, 50; and educ. work, 242.
- Graham, Dr. Alexander, and land speculation, 174-75.
- Grant, Ulysses S., 1864-65 mil. campaigns, 400-401.
- Grayson, William J., views on land speculation, 156.
- Greeley, Horace, mentioned, 188; and 1855-56 speakership contest, 195.
- Green, Duff, and Eaton Affair, 458 ff.
- Green, Fletcher M., "Annual Rpt. of the Secy.-Treas.," 76-80; mentioned, 146, 276, 573; revs. Fraser's *Dem. in the Making*, 397-98.
- Greensboro Historical Museum, opening announced, 418.
- Gregorie, Anne K., rpt. on S. C. hist'l agencies, synop., 73.
- Griffin, Cyrus, reconciliation plan, 98-101.
- Griffith, Dr. Hamilton, land speculator, 183-84.
- Griggs, Earl L., *Thomas Clarkson*, revd., 392-93.
- Grover, A. J., abolitionist, 221.
- Grow, Galusha A., mentioned, 191.
- Guenther, J. Ed, and L. and N. R. R., 48.
- Guilford, A Quaker College*, by Dorothy L. Gilbert, noted, 575.
- Habersham, Richard W., letter to Berrien, 460-61, 462.
- Hale, Oron J., mentioned, 276.
- Hall, Arthur R., discusses soil conservation in S. C., 71.
- Hall, Ellery L., mentioned, 413.
- Halsey, Edwin G., land speculator, 177.
- Hamer, Philip M., "The Records of So. Hist.," 3-17; pres. address, noted, 72; mentioned, 278.
- Hamilton, A., of Ky., land speculator, 160.
- Hamilton, Alexander, influence on U. S. pol. econ., 501 ff.
- Hamilton, George H., and land speculation, 160.
- Hamilton, Hugh L., *A Second Cons. for the U. S.*, revd., 121-22.
- Hamilton, J. G. de R., mentioned, 73.
- Hamilton, James, Jr., mentioned, 451.
- Hamilton, James C., and land speculation, 160.
- Hamilton, William B., mentioned, 279.
- Hampton, Wade, land speculator, 158.
- Handbook of Oklahoma Writers*, by Mary H. Marable and Elaine Boylan, revd., 389-90.
- Hanna, A. J., mentioned, 77; *Flight into Oblivion*, revd., 269-70.
- Hanscom, S. P., lobbist, 195.
- Harbison, William, and brothers, land speculators, 179.
- Hardin, P. Wat, and Ky. politics, 36 ff.
- Harper's Ferry, plot, forerunner of Brown's raid, 220.
- Harrington, Fred H., "The First No. Victory," 186-205.
- Harris, Robert J., ed. *Journal of Politics*, 280.
- Harris, Rufus C., mentioned, 72.
- Harrison, Benjamin, mentioned, 242-43.
- Harrison, John S., and 1855-56 speakership contest, 191, 195.
- Hartford Convention, cited as beginning of abolitionism, 532-33.
- Harvey Belden*, by Nathaniel Ware, discussed, 510.

- Hasell, Thomas, S. P. G. missionary, 493, 494-95.
- Haven, Solomon G., and 1855-56 speakership election, 187.
- Hay, Thomas R., revs. Burne's *Lee, Grant and Sherman*, 400-401.
- Hayes, Rutherford B., and Slater fund work, 223-45.
- Hayes Memorial Library, ann. rpt., 1937-38, noted, 279; grants-in-aid, 415.
- Haygood, Atticus G., and Slater fund work, 223-45.
- Hayne, Robert Y., mentioned, 451.
- Haynes, Thomas, candidate for Ga. gov., 461.
- Hege, Josephine, mentioned, 412.
- Helderman, Leonard C., mentioned, 276.
- Helm, James P., mentioned, 44.
- Henderson, Gavin B. (ed.), "So. Designs on Cuba," 371-85.
- Herbert, Philemon T., mentioned, 191.
- Herndon, Dallas T., *Ark. Handbook*, 1937-1938, noted, 131.
- Higgins, Joel, land speculator, 167.
- Higgins, Richard, land speculator, 167.
- Hill, Lawrence F., mentioned, 276.
- Hill, Roscoe R., mentioned, 413, 414. "Hillbilly," and tobacco wars, 355 ff.
- Historic Sites Act, discussed, 64.
- Historical records, preservation, 3-17; laws conserving, 9 ff.
- Historical Records Survey, publications noted, 131, 419; appointments, 413.
- Historical research, aids to, subject of discussion, 66, 72-73.
- Historical Scholarship in the United States, 1876-1901*, ed. by W. Stull Holt, revd., 561-62.
- Historical sociology, identification, 333.
- History of Colquitt County*, by W. A. Covington, noted, 130-31.
- History of History*, by James T. Shotwell, revd., 386-87.
- History of Louisiana State University*, by W. L. Fleming, noted, 151.
- History of the South, co-op. 10 volume, announced, 278.
- Hodges, Charles, mentioned, 413.
- Hoey, Clyde R., mentioned, 418.
- Hogan, William R., mentioned, 64.
- Holcombe, Arthur N., mentioned, 414-15.
- Holderness, W. H., views on Cuban filibuster, 375-76.
- Holmes, Alester G., revs. Taylor and McDavid's (eds.) *Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts*, 120-21.
- Holt, John D., land speculator, 163.
- Holt, W. Stull, revs. Edwards' *Early Writings of Frederick Turner*, 387-89; (ed.) *Hist'l Scholarship in the U. S.*, revd., 561-62.
- Homestead legislation, supported by Southerners, 312.
- Horn, Stanley F., *Invisible Empire*, revd., 402-404.
- House, Albert V., Jr., "The So. and No. Democratic Cong. Leaders during Reconstruction and After," synop., 67-68.
- Houston, Sam, writings of, revd., 259-61.
- Howard, William E., collection given to Dallas Hist'l Soc., 130.
- Howden, Lord, views on Anglo-Am. relations, 376 ff.
- Humphrey, Samuel P., land speculator, 167.
- Hunt, Brian, and Indian relig. work, 496.
- Hunt, Francis K., land speculator, 171.
- Hunt, William G., views on Tenn. culture, 24.
- Hunter, Charles E., mentioned, 124.
- Hunter, R. M. T., land speculator, 164-66.
- Hurley, Michael, land speculator, 177.
- Hurley, William, land speculator, 177, 184.
- Hyams, Henry M., ed. *Sugar Planter*, 323.
- Illinois, land speculation in, 156 ff.
- Immigration, into S. C., 83-98; attempts to encourage, to La., 326-27.
- Implements, agric., and sugar industry, 318, 328 ff.
- In Memoriam: William Kenneth Boyd, January 10, 1879-January 19, 1938*, noted, 280.
- "Indian Frontier in South Carolina as Seen by the S. P. G. Missionary," by Frank J. Klingberg, 479-500.
- Indiana, land speculation in, 156.
- Indians, and Turner thesis, 297, 301 ff.; policy of Jackson adm. toward, 447 ff.; S. P. G. missionaries among, 479-500; S. C., as viewed by Ger.-Swiss emigrants, 95 ff.
- Ingham, Samuel D., and Jackson adm., 454 ff.
- Insurrection, slave, panic of 1856, pp. 206-22; vol. on, 265-66.
- Internal Improvement in South Carolina, 1817-1828*, ed. by David Kohn and Bess Glenn, revd., 395-96.
- Internal improvements, Ky., conflict over, 35 ff.; as discussed in Ware's pol. econ., 518 ff.; S. C., 395-96; La. levee system, 329-30.
- Introduction to the History of Bermuda*, by Wesley F. Craven, revd., 102-103.
- Investments, So., in No. lands, 155-85.
- Invisible Empire: The Story of the Ku Klux Klan, 1866-1871*, by Stanley F. Horn, revd., 402-404.
- Iowa, land speculation in, 156 ff.
- Irish, emigration to La., 326.
- Iron manufacture, and slave worker's plot, 210-12.

- Irvine, Dallas, mentioned, 77.
- Isaac Franklin, Slave Trader and Planter of the Old South*, by Wendell H. Stephenson, revd., 109-10.
- Ittiwan, religious work among, 480 ff.
- Jackson, Andrew, mentioned, 297, 302, 523; political policy, 397-98; relations with Berrien, 447-67.
- Jackson, "Stonewall," Benjamin's removal of, 473.
- Jacksonville Historical Society, meeting noted, 416-17.
- James, Powhatan W., *George W. Truett*, revd., 410.
- James Madison: Philosopher of the Constitution*, by Edward M. Burns, revd., 258-59.
- Jamestown, project at, explained, 572.
- Jamestown and St. Mary's, Buried Cities of Romance*, by Henry C. Forman, revd., 390-92.
- Jaquess, James, peace agent, 476.
- Jay, John, diplomacy of, and West, 105-106.
- Jefferson, Thomas, mentioned, 297; statesmanship criticized, 523 ff.
- Jennings, Obadiah, debate with Campbell, 32-33.
- Jesup, Morris K., controversies with Haygood, 223 ff.
- John Berrien Lindsley: Educator, Physician, Social Philosopher*, by John E. Windrow, revd., 261-62.
- "John M. Berrien and the Administration of Andrew Jackson," by Thomas P. Govan, 447-67.
- "John Tobler Manuscripts: An Account of German-Swiss Emigrants in South Carolina, 1737," ed. by Charles G. Cordle, 83-97.
- Johnson, Cary, mentioned, 125.
- Johnson, Gerald W., mentioned, 414.
- Johnson, Richard M., mentioned, 458 ff.
- Johnson, William, and Indian religious work, 488.
- Johnston, Frontis W., mentioned, 574.
- Johnston, Gideon, S. P. G. commissary, 483 ff.
- Johnston, Joseph E., mentioned, 418; relations with Benjamin, 473, 474-75.
- Jones, Dorsey D., mentioned, 412.
- Jones, George W., mentioned, 190.
- Jones, W. H., mentioned, 39.
- Jordon, W. T., mentioned, 276.
- Journal of Mississippi History*, announced, 279.
- Journal of Politics*, announced, 280.
- Journal of the History of Ideas*, announced, 419.
- Kansas, settlement, as political issue, 187 ff.; and slave question, 206; conflict over slavery, 299-300.
- Kansas-Nebraska Act, and 1855-56 speakership election, 186 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 538 ff.
- Kegley, B. F., *Kegley's Va. Frontier*, revd., 103-104.
- Kegley's Virginia Frontier; the Beginning of the Southwest; the Roanoke of Colonial Days*, by B. F. Kegley, revd., 103-104.
- Kellar, Herbert A., program work commended, 76-77; revs. Sydnor's *Benjamin L. C. Wailes*, 114-15; delivers Fleming Lectures, 275; reminiscence of Phillips, noted, 367; revs. Drake and Orndorff's *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare*, 556-57.
- Kelly, John, mentioned, 190.
- Kemble, Fanny, biog. of, revd., 110-12.
- Kendrick, Benjamin B., discusses Turner paper, 66; revs. Du Bois' *Black Folk*, 564-65.
- Kenner, Duncan, Br. mission, 476.
- Kentucky, preservation of hist'l records, 6, 8; archives dept., 12; R. Rs., Goebel and, 34-48; in Reconstruction, 35; cons., 35-36; slave insurrection panic, 209-15, 222; Am. Soc. of Equity in, 347-63; liberalism in, 393-94.
- Kentucky, Univ. of, library acquisitions, 282.
- Key, Francis Scott, and Jackson adm., 455-56.
- King, Rufus, and Mo. question, 533.
- King, William M., land speculator, 179.
- Kinney, John F., land speculator, 173.
- Klingberg, Frank J., *Old Sherry*, revd., 119-20; "The Indian Frontier in S. C.," 479-500.
- Knott, Richard, mentioned, 44.
- Know Nothings, and 1855-56 speakership election, 187 ff.; 1860 campaign, 247; hist., 266-67.
- Kohlmeier, A. L., *Old Northwest*, revd., 112-13.
- Kohn, David (co-ed.), *Internal Improvements in S. C.*, revd., 395-96.
- Ku Klux Klan, history, misrepresentation of, 50; study of, revd., 402-404.
- Kuhlman, A. F., "Collection, Organization, and Preservation of Hist'l Source Materials," synop., 72.
- Lacy, Dan, mentioned, 413.
- Lafourche, Bayou, sugar planting on, 313 ff.
- LaFuze, Leighton, mentioned, 125.
- Lakanal, Joseph, French regicide in U. S., 558.

- Land, public, Tenn. laws conc., 25 ff.; legislation, and Turner thesis, 297; speculation in, 155-85, 307-308; value, decrease after Civil War, 321 ff.
- Landlord, Ky., and tobacco wars, 349 ff.
- Landon, Fred, "Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the So." 74, 364-71.
- Lane, James H., mentioned, 177.
- Langsam, Walter C., mentioned, 276.
- Lanning, John T., mentioned, 414.
- Lathrop, Barnes F., discusses microfilming, 66.
- Lattimer, David W., mentioned, 125.
- Lawson McGhee Library, acquisitions, 421.
- Lea, Isaac, mentioned, 505.
- Leavens, Joshua B., land speculator, 178.
- LeBus, Clarence, pres. Burley Tobacco Soc., 353 ff.
- Ledoux, A., and Co., N. O. factors, 434.
- Lee, Robert E., 1864-65 campaigns, 400-401.
- Lee, Ronald F., "Objectives and Policies in the Conservation of Historic Sites," synop., 64; communication, 572.
- Lee, Grant and Sherman: A Study in Leadership in the 1864-65 Campaign*, by Alfred H. Burne, revd., 400-401.
- Leigh, Thomas, land speculator, 163.
- Le Jau, Francis, relig. work in col. S. C., 480 ff.
- Leland, Edwin A., mentioned, 76.
- Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857*, ed. by Dwight L. Dumond, revd., 263-64.
- Levees, and La. sugar industry, 329-30.
- Lexington during the Civil War*, by J. Winston Coleman, Jr., noted, 131.
- Liberal Kentucky, 1780-1828*, by Niels H. Sonne, revd., 393-94.
- Liberia, causes of failure, 59-60.
- Library of Congress, preservation of hist'l records, 13; acquisitions, 129.
- Life and Labor in the Old South*, by U. B. Phillips, discussed, 367, 369.
- Lillard, Eph., mentioned, 34.
- Lincecum, Gideon, migrations to So. Wests, 303-304.
- Lincoln, Abraham, as viewed by Canadian, 248 ff; candidacy attacked by Douglas, 527 ff.; study of assassin, revd., 401-402.
- Lindsley, John Berrien, biog., revd., 261-62.
- Lindsley, Philip, pres. Univ. of Nashville, career, 18 ff.; and Tenn. frontier culture, 19 ff.; mentioned, 262.
- List, Friedrich, mentioned, 512.
- Literature, frontier habits and, 21 ff.
- Livestock, Civil War losses, and sugar industry, 318 ff.
- Livingood, James W., revs. McFerrin's *Caldwell and Co.*, 570-71.
- Livingston, Edward, mentioned, 455.
- Livingstone, David, mentioned, 485.
- Lockmiller, David A., mentioned, 412.
- Lohrer, Jane, mentioned, 412.
- Longstreet, Augustus B., mentioned, 463.
- Lonn, Ella, revs. Caskey's *Secession and Restoration of La.*, 268-69.
- Loose, Joseph B., land speculator, 166-67.
- Loughborough, Preston S., land speculator, 169.
- Louisiana, archival agency, 12; sugar industry, 63-64, 315 ff.; Hist'l Records Survey work, 131, 419 ff.; capital invested in No. lands, 156 ff.; slave insurrection panic, 217-18; Slater fund work, 228 ff.; secession and restoration, 268-69; purchase and Cons., 294; cattle days, 302-303; plantation life, 431-46.
- Louisiana State University, acquires Ely Collection, 129; Fleming and, 151 ff.; Dept. of Archives and Hist., acquisitions, 422.
- Louisville and Nashville Railroad, and Ky. politics, 37 ff.
- Lowenberg, Burt J., mentioned, 276.
- Ludham, Richard, S. P. G. missionary, 498.
- Lumpkin, Wilson, and Jackson adm., 461.
- Macartney, Clarence E., (co-auth.), *Bonapartes in Am.*, revd., 557-58.
- McCain, William D., ed. of Miss. hist'l jour., 279.
- McChord, Charles C., and Ky. R. R. bill, 38 ff.
- McConnell, Andrew, mentioned, 48.
- McConnell, Felix, supports homestead bills, 312.
- McCordock, Robert S., *Yankee Cheese Box*, revd., 117-18.
- McDavid, Raven I. (co-ed.), *Memoirs of Richard C. Watts*, revd., 120-21.
- McDonald, Hunter, mentioned, 79.
- McDuffie, George, mentioned, 451.
- McFadyen, Christiana, mentioned, 412.
- McFarland, John, land speculator, 167.
- McFerrin, John B., *Caldwell and Co.*, revd., 570-71.
- McGeachy, J. A., mentioned, 574.
- McGee, Thomas D'Arcy, mentioned, 250.
- McGillivray of the Creeks*, by John W. Caughey, revd., 106-107.
- McGreedy, James, mentioned, 27.
- McKinley, William, mentioned, 38.
- McLane, Louis, mentioned, 452.
- McLemore, R. A., mentioned, 279.
- McMillan, George W., organizes tobacco farmers, 353.
- McMullen, Fayette, threatens secession, 205.
- McMurtrie, Douglas C., discusses Am. Imprints Survey, 71; mentioned, 418.

- McSwain, H. E., supports "Equity idea," 352 ff.
- Madison, James, biog., revd., 258-59.
- Mahone, William, unpopularity in So., 243.
- Malhot, E. E., land speculator, 158-59, 183.
- Malin, James C., mentioned, 124.
- Malthus, Thomas, influence on nat. economists, 501 ff.
- Man Who Killed Lincoln*, by Philip Van Doren Stern, revd., 401-402.
- Manchester, Alan K., mentioned, 414.
- Mann, Dudley, and Ostend Manifesto, 373 ff.
- Manufacture, sugar, effect of Civil War on, 315 ff.; home, on La. plantation, 435 ff.
- Marable, Mary H. (co-auth.), *Handbook of Okla. Writers*, revd., 389-90.
- Marcy, William L., and Ostend Manifesto, 373-74.
- Marshall, Humphrey, views on Neb. bill, 188; speakership candidate, 191 ff.
- Martineau, Harriet, views on Ger. settlers, 342-43.
- Maryland, Hall of Records, 12; slave insurrection plots, 219; crime and punishment in early, 255-57.
- Mason, George, mentioned, 531.
- Massachusetts, and Griffin's peace plan, 99-100.
- Massey, Maria M., mentioned, 125.
- Mather, John, land speculator, 175.
- Maule, Robert, S. P. G. missionary, 481 ff.
- Meade, Robert D., mentioned, 77, 573; "Relations Between Benjamin and Davis," 468-78.
- "Medical Theory and Practice in the Confederacy," by George Adams, synop., 70.
- Medicine, frontier practice, 21 ff.
- Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina, 1927-1930*, ed. by Rosser H. Taylor and Raven I. McDavid, revd., 120-21.
- Memphis, hist. of, revd., 554-55.
- Mendenhall, Marjorie, paper on James H. Hammond, planter, synop., 63.
- Mercer, Charles F., erroneously credited with vol., 508-509.
- Merrimac*, hist. of, 117-18.
- Methodists, and Tenn. culture, 27 ff.; and Slater fund work, 226 ff.; and Trinity College, 405-407.
- Mexicans, and slave plots, 208.
- Michigan, land speculation in, 156 ff.
- Microfilming, work on So. materials, 66.
- Millechamp, Timothy, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
- Milling industry, development, 556-57.
- Missionaries, S. P. G., on S. C. frontier, 479-500.
- Mississippi, preservation of hist'l records, 7, 8; hist'l commission, 11; Negro in, 58-59; territorial papers, 108-109; land speculation, 156; slave insurrection panic, 218; Slater fund work, 232 ff.; emigration to, 301 ff.; and Indian question, 447.
- Mississippi Department of Archives and History, established, 11; compilations, 127; acquisitions, 129, 420, 575.
- Mississippi River, sugar planting on, 315 ff.
- Mississippi Valley Historical Association, ann. meeting noted, 415-16.
- Missouri, land speculation in, 156 ff.; slave insurrection panic, 215-16.
- Missouri Compromise, Douglas' view conc., 532 ff.
- Mitchell, Dr. C. B., land purchases, 166.
- Mitchell, George S. (co-auth.), *Black Workers and the New Unions*, revd., 567-68.
- Moffitt, James W., revs. Marable and Boylan's *A Handbook of Okla. Writers*, 389-90.
- Moger, Allen W., revs. Palmer's *Carter Glass*, 408-409.
- Monitor*, influence on Civil War, 117.
- Monroe, James, mentioned, 297; and So. Indian question, 448.
- Montague, Ludwell L., mentioned, 276.
- "Montgomery Address of Stephen A. Douglas," ed. by David R. Barbee and Millidge L. Bonham, Jr., 527-52.
- Moody, V. Alton, "No. Trade with So. in the Ante-Bellum Period," synop., 67; mentioned, 276.
- Mooney, Chase, mentioned, 276, 574.
- Moore, Albert B., revs. Nixon's *Forty Acres and Steel Mules*, 568-70.
- Moore, Harry E., "Future Regions of the U. S.," synop., 69-70.
- Moore, Ike, mentioned, 413.
- Moore, Ross H., mentioned, 125, 279.
- Moorehead, Paul G., mentioned, 276.
- Morrill, Justin S., mentioned, 191.
- Morritt, Thomas, S. P. G. missionary, 496-97.
- Morton, Richard L., revs. Bean's *Peopling of Va.*, 257-58.
- Morton, Samuel B., mentioned, 338.
- Mott, Richard, mentioned, 191.
- Mowry, George E., mentioned, 125.
- Museum, Nashville, established, 22.
- Nairne, Thomas, Indian agent in S. C., 486-88.
- Napier, Lord, and Cuban question, 383-84.
- Napoleon, Louis, relations with Confed., 475-76.
- Nashville, cultural development, 19 ff.; conv., and So. rights, 535.

- Nashville Female Academy, mentioned, 22.
 Natchez, frontier life in, 305-306.
 "Natchez Trace as an Historic Site Problem," by Malcolm E. Gardner, synop., 64-65.
 "Nathaniel A. Ware, National Economist," by William Diamond, 501-26.
 National Archives, preservation of hist'l records, 13 ff.; acquisitions, 130, 282, 421-22.
 National economy, school of political econ., 501-26.
 National Park Service, preserves hist'l sites, 13; activities discussed, 64-65.
 Nationalism, in relation to Turner thesis, 295 ff.; as a hist'l determinant, 333 ff.
 Nativism, American, origins, 266-67.
 Naudain, Arnold, land speculator, 169.
 Nebraska, settlement, as political issue, 188 ff.
 Negro, in Reconstruction, new viewpoints, 49 ff.; inferiority of, discussed, 69; Fleming's writings about, 149 ff.; free, and slave insurrections, 211 ff.; Slater fund work, 224 ff.; educ., 224 ff., 273-74; and Turner thesis, 299 ff.; free, and sugar industry, 323 ff.; and hist'l determinants, 337; Phillips' writings about, 368-69; labor legislation and, 408; hist. and sociology, 564-65; hist. of, in U. S., 565-66; as laborers, 567-69. See also Slavery.
Negro Education in Alabama: A Study in Cotton and Steel, by Horace Mann Bond, revd., 404-405.
Negro in Brazil, by Arthur Ramos, trans. by Richard Pattie, noted, 575.
 New Deal, rev. of book relative to, 568-70.
 New Mexico, Douglas and territory of, 534-35, 547.
 New Orleans, humorous sketches, 264-65; trade, 305.
 New Orleans *Price-Current*, sugar statistics, 316 ff.
 "New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction," by Francis B. Simkins, 49-61.
 Newman, A. H., mentioned, 29.
Newsome, Albert R., Pres. Election of 1824 in N. C., revd., 396-97; revs. Holt's (ed.) *Hist'l Scholarship in the U. S.*, 561-62.
 Newspapers, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 188 ff.; and slave insurrections, 207 ff.; and 1860-61 parties and issues, 246 ff.; sugar statistics, 316 ff.; and Eaton affair, 457 ff.; Ala., and Douglas, 529.
 "Night Riding," and Ky. tobacco wars, 347 ff.
 Niles, Hezekiah, nat. economist, 501 ff.
 Nixon, H. C., mentioned, 413; revs. Cayton and Mitchell's (co-auths.) *Black Workers and the New Unions*, 567-68; *Forty Acres and Steel Mules*, revd., 568-70.
 North Carolina, preservation of hist'l records, 6, 10; Hist'l Commission, 12; Hist'l Records survey work, 131; interest in Slater fund work, 227 ff.; church-state relations in educ., 272-73; emigration from, 300 ff.; 1824 pres. election in, 396-97; educ., 405-407.
 North Carolina, Univ. of, library acquisitions, 419.
 North Carolina Historical Commission, acquisitions, 417-18.
 North Carolina State Literary and Historical Association, ann. meeting, 128.
 Northrop, Lucius B., mentioned, 469.
 Northwest, Old, commerce and politics, 112-13.
Notes on Political Economy, by Nathaniel Ware, discussed, 508, 522 ff.
 Nullification, S. C., effect on Ga. politics, 464 ff.
 Odum, Howard W., mentioned, 414.
 Ohio, land speculation in, 156 ff.
 Ohio River, Shelburne's plans to secure, 105-106.
 Oklahoma, handbook of writers, 389-90.
 Oklahoma Hist'l Soc., early work, 13; acquisitions, 130, 282, 575; ann. meeting, noted, 416.
Old Frontiers: The Story of the Cherokee Indians, by John P. Brown, revd., 107-108.
Old Northwest as the Keystone of the Arch of American Federal Union: A Study in Commerce and Politics, by A. L. Kohlmeier, revd., 112-13.
Old Sherry: Portrait of a Virginia Family, by Frank J. Klingberg, revd., 119-20.
 "Old West," by Frederick J. Turner, noted, 297 ff.
 Opelousas region, sugar planting in, 315 ff.
 Orndorff, James R. (co-auth.), *From Mill Wheel to Plowshare*, revd., 556-57.
 Orndorff family, hist. of, revd., 556-57.
 Orr, William, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
 Osburn, Nathaniel, S. P. G. missionary, 494.
 Osgood, Herbert L., mentioned, 145.
Other Half of Old New Orleans, col. and ed. by E. Merton Coulter, revd., 264-65.
 Ott, Edward, revs. Bolton's *Wider Horizons of Am. Hist.*, 563-64.
Our First Great West in Revolutionary War, Diplomacy and Politics, by Temple Bodley, revd., 105-106.

- Overdyke, W. Darrell, revs. Billington's *Protestant Crusade*, 266-67.
- Owen, Marie B., Ala., revd., 394.
- Owen, Thomas M., Ala. archivist, 10-11.
- Owens, Thomas E., land speculator, 163.
- Owsley, Frank L., "Population Structure of the Late Ante-Bellum South," synop., 69; mentioned, 78, 276; revs. Dumond's (ed.) *Letters of James G. Birney*, 263-64.
- Pace, Jerman W., land speculator, 177.
- Pairo and Nourse, land speculators, 163-64.
- Palmer, James E., *Carter Glass*, revd., 408-409.
- Palmerston, Lord, and Cuban question, 375 ff.
- Panic of 1857, effect on land speculation, 163 ff.
- Parker, Daniel, and Tenn. culture, 31.
- Parks, Edd W., *Segments of So. Thought*, revd., 558-60.
- Parsons, Edward A., address noted, 68.
- Patrick, Rembert W., mentioned, 412.
- Pattie, Richard (trans.), Arthur Ramos, *Negro in Brazil*, noted, 575.
- Paxson, Frederic L., criticism of Turner thesis, 299.
- Peabody Education Fund, relation to Slater fund work, 223 ff.
- Peaceful Riders by Day, and tobacco wars, 358 ff.
- Peck, J. M., cycle of settlement, 310.
- Pennington, Alexander C. M., speakership candidate, 190 ff.
- "People, William Goebel, and the Kentucky Railroads," by Thomas D. Clark, 34-48.
- Peopling of Virginia*, by R. Bennett Bean, revd., 257-58.
- Perry, Horatio J., relations with Spanish govt., 376.
- Perry, Percival, mentioned, 574.
- Personal Recollections of Trinity College, North Carolina, 1887-1894*, by John F. Crowell, revd., 405-407.
- Peters, Francis J., land speculator, 179.
- Petrie, George, influence on So. scholarship, 145, 153.
- Peyton, Mary Lou, mentioned, 279.
- Phillips, U. B., paper on, noted, 74; Negro thesis, 299; and geog. determinism, 340; evaluation of work, 364-71.
- Pickett, Courtney, land speculator, 167.
- Pierce, Franklin, adm., and speakership election, 187 ff.; and Cuban question, 374; nomination for pres., 537.
- Pierpont, Francis H., and W. Va., 118-19.
- Planters' Protective Association, and tobacco industry, 352, 354 ff.
- Plummer, Franklin, supports homestead bills, 312.
- Pomfret, John R., mentioned, 71.
- Pooling, tobacco, attempts at, 354 ff.
- Popular sovereignty, Douglas' interpretation, 539 ff.
- "Population Structure of the Late Ante-Bellum South," by Frank L. Owsley, synop., 69.
- Populist movement, effect on hist'l guild, 291-92.
- Posey, Walter B., elected to board of eds., 77; mentioned, 78, 124.
- Potter, David M., mentioned, 125.
- Pre-emption laws, supported by Southerners, 312.
- Presbyterian, and Tenn. culture, 27 ff.; liberalism, 393-94.
- Presidential address, Philip M. Hamer's, 3-17.
- Presidential Election of 1824 in North Carolina*, by Albert R. Newsome, revd., 396-97.
- Prichard, Walter, "The Effects of the Civil War on the La. Sugar Industry," 63-64, 315-32.
- Princeton, Lindsley and, 18-19.
- Pritchard, J. C., mentioned, 338.
- Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism*, by Ray A. Billington, revd., 266-67.
- PWA, constructs buildings for archives, 13-14.
- Quakers, and hist'l determinism, 345.
- Quitman, John A., attempts Cuban filibusters, 374 ff.
- Race, prejudice, Reconstruction and, 49 ff.; relations, Reconstruction and, 51 ff.; theory, hist'l determinism and, 334 ff.
- Racing, La., and planters, 443-44.
- Radicals, Reconstruction policy, 56 ff.
- Radoff, Morris, mentioned, 413.
- Rae, John, economist, 501 ff.
- Ragatz, Lowell J., revs. Craven's *Introduction to the Hist. of Bermuda*, 102-103.
- Raglund, Evan, land speculator, 163.
- Rainwater, P. L., mentioned, 126, 279, 413.
- Ramos, Arthur, *Negro in Brazil*, noted, 575.
- Rampaging Frontier: Manners and Humors of Pioneer Days in the South and Middle West*, by Thomas D. Clark, revd., 398-99.
- Ramsay, David, view of Am. culture, 336.
- Ramsdell, Charles W., mentioned, 63; co-ed. Hist. of the So., 278; revs. Craven's *Repressible Conflict*, 553-54.
- Ramsey, J. F., mentioned, 276.
- Randall, James G., mentioned, 182.
- Randall, Samuel J., mentioned, 68.
- Randolph, George W., mentioned, 469; relations with Davis, 472.
- Raymond, Daniel, nat. econ., 501 ff.

- Recollections of War and Peace, 1861-1868*, by Anna P. Siviter, revd., 118-19.
- Reconstruction, new viewpoints of, 49-61; Fleming's writings on, 146 ff.; and La. sugar industry, 319-32.
- "Records of Southern History," by Philip M. Hamer, 3-17.
- Red River, La., sugar culture along, 315 ff.
- Redwine, D. B., and "Music Hall" convention, 42.
- Regier, C. C., revs. Klingberg's *Old Sherry*, 119-20.
- Regulator movement, as dem. force, 297.
- "Relations Between Judah P. Benjamin and Jefferson Davis: Some New Light on the Working of the Confederate Machine," by Robert D. Meade, 468-78.
- Religion, force in frontier culture, 27 ff.; Ger.-Swiss views on, 87 ff.; frontier, in So., 307; as hist'l determinant, 333 ff.; attitude of So. planter, 441; on S. C. frontier, 479-500.
- Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861*, by Avery Craven, revd., 553-54.
- Republican party, in Ky., 1891-1900, pp. 35 ff.; and 1855-56 speakership election, 187; in 1856, as viewed by South, 207; a Canadian view, 247 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 528 ff.
- "Research Projects in Southern History; First Annual Supplement," comp. by Fred C. Cole, 581-86.
- Resources of Southern Libraries: A Survey of Facilities for Research*, ed. by Robert B. Downs, noted, 130.
- Revolutionary War, West in, 105-106.
- Reynolds, J. H., and Ark. archives, 11.
- Rhett, Robert B., views on Benjamin, 472; mentioned, 528.
- Rhodes, James Ford, on the Negro, 58.
- Ricardo, David, theories, and nat. economists, 501 ff.
- Rice, Henry M., land speculator, 175.
- Richardson, John P., interest in Negro educ., 241.
- Richardson, William A., land speculator, 166; and 1855-56 speakership contest, 190 ff.
- Riggs, Elisha, land speculator, 173.
- Riggs, George W., land speculator, 166.
- Riley, Franklin L., and Miss. archives, 11.
- Robert, Joseph C., mentioned, 124.
- Roberts, Jesse, manages land speculation, 157-58.
- Roberts, W. Adolphe, *Semmes of the Alabama*, revd., 115-17.
- Robertson, James A., death noted, 414.
- Robinson, James Harvey, mentioned, 145.
- Robinson, William M., Jr., revs. Roberts' *Semmes of the Ala.*, 115-17; revs. Hamilton's *Second Cons. for the U. S.*, 121-22.
- Robison, Georgia, mentioned, 412.
- Roe, Stephen, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
- Rorer, Henry S. (ed.), "Cyrus Griffin's Plan of Reconciliation with the Am. Cols.," 98-101.
- Rowland, Dunbar, and Miss. archives, 11.
- Ruffin, Edmund, mentioned, 63.
- Rush, Benjamin, authropological writings, 337-38.
- Russell, Josiah C., mentioned, 124.
- Russia, relation with U. S., 372 ff.
- Rust, Albert, and 1855-56 speakership contest, 200.
- Sage, Russell, mentioned, 191.
- St. Francisville, La., ante-bellum entrepôt, 432 ff.
- St. Mary's, Va., study of hist., 390-92.
- Saloutos, Theodore, "Am. Soc. of Equity in Ky.," 347-63.
- Sanders, Jennings B., revs. Burns' *James Madison*, 258-59.
- Sanford, John, duel with Goebel, 37.
- Savannah, Ger.-Swiss emigrants in, 83 ff.
- Savannah Indians, relig. work among, 480 ff.
- Say, Jean Baptiste, mentioned, 512.
- Scalawags, new viewpoints concerning, 56 ff.
- Schell, Richard, land speculator, 175.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., mentioned, 275.
- Schmidt, Louis B., mentioned, 276.
- Schools, public, Tenn., 22 ff.
- Schreeven, William J. Van, mentioned, 125.
- Science, So., B. L. C. Wailes and, 114-15.
- Scotch-Irish, and frontier development, 295, 298.
- Scott, Isaac W., land speculator, 167.
- Scott, Matthew T., land speculator, 167.
- Scott, Matthew T., Jr., land speculator, 167.
- Scott, Winfield, nomination for pres., 537.
- Scully, William, land speculator, 160.
- Sears, Barnas, and Peabody fund, 225.
- Seay, Thomas, and Slater fund work, 239-40.
- Secession, a Canadian view of, 250 ff.; Douglas' views conc., 548 ff.
- Secession and Restoration of Louisiana*, by Willie M. Caskey, revd., 268-69.
- Second Constitution for the United States of America*, by Hugh L. Hamilton, revd., 121-22.
- Sectionalism, and Turner thesis, 293 ff.
- Seddon, James A., mentioned, 469.
- Seegers, L. Walter, mentioned, 125.
- Segments of Southern Thought*, by Edd W. Parks, revd., 558-60.

- Seibels, J. J., and Fr.-Br. relations, 377; and Douglas, 529.
- Seligman, Edwin R. A., mentioned, 145.
- Seminole War, issue in Jackson adm., 453 ff.
- Semmes, Raphael, *Crime and Punishment in Early Md.*, revd., 255-57.
- Semmes of the Alabama*, by W. Adolphe Roberts, revd., 115-17.
- Semple, Ellen, mentioned, 339.
- Sequel of Appomattox*, by W. L. Fleming, appraised, 147.
- Seward, William H., criticized by Douglas, 531 ff.
- Shaler, Nathaniel S., mentioned, 339.
- Shanks, Henry T., revs. Siviter's *Recollections of War and Peace*, 118-19.
- Share-crop system, development of, 53 ff.; and tobacco industry, 348 ff.
- Sheppard, George, life, 245-46; views on 1860-61 parties and issues, 247-53.
- Sherman, John, mentioned, 191.
- Sherman, W. T., 1864-65 campaigns, 400-401.
- Sherman Anti-Trust Act, and tobacco organizations, 362.
- Short, Charles W., speculator in lands, 170.
- Short History of the Americas*, by R. S. Cotterill, noted, 575.
- Shorter, Eli S., speculates in lands, 171-72, 177.
- Shotwell, James T., *Hist. of Hist.*, revd., 386-87.
- Shryock, Richard H., "Cultural Factors in the Hist. of the So.," 68-69, 333-46.
- Shugg, Roger W., mentioned, 124, 125.
- "Significance of the Frontier in American History," by Frederick Jackson Turner, evaluated, 293 ff.
- Siler, Adam T., mentioned, 47.
- Simkins, Francis B., "New Viewpoints of So. Reconstruction," 49-61.
- Simms, Fenton, mentioned, 39.
- Sitterson, J. Carlisle, mentioned, 276, 413.
- Siviter, Anna P., *Recollections of War and Peace*, revd., 118-19.
- Skipper, O. C., "J. D. B. De Bow and the Seventh Census," synop., 73-74.
- "Slater Fund Beginnings: Letters from General Agent Atticus G. Haygood to Rutherford B. Hayes," ed. by Curtis W. Garrison, 223-45.
- "Slave Insurrection Panic of 1856," by Harvey Wish, 206-22.
- Slave Insurrections in the United States, 1800-1865*, by Joseph C. Carroll, revd., 265-66.
- Slavery, effect of destroying, 51 ff.; effect of Fed. invasion on, 67; extent, 69; in col. S. C., 89 ff.; trade, 109-110; and Kan.-Neb. question, 187 ff.; a Canadian view, 252-53; attitudes toward, and Turner thesis, 297 ff.; frontier development and, 309 ff.; and La. sugar industry, 318 ff.; and hist'l determinism, 337 ff.; expansion, Cuba and, 373 ff.; Thomas Clarkson and, 392-93; on La. plantation, 436 ff.; emancipation offered, 476; S. P. G. work among, 480 ff.; in Ware's pol. econ., 514, 516 ff.; Douglas' attitude toward, 529 ff.; defense and abolitionism, 553-54.
- Sloane, William M., mentioned, 145.
- Smith, Adam, pol. econ. attacked, 501 ff.
- Smith, Alfred E., mentioned, 49.
- Smith, Charles E., mentioned, 276; revs., Shotwell's *Hist. of Hist.*, 386-87.
- Smith, Culver H., mentioned, 276.
- Smith, Francis L., land speculator, 179, 184.
- Smith, Hoke, mentioned, 50.
- Smith, Captain John, mentioned, 336.
- Smith, Milton H., mentioned, 37, 40.
- Smith, Robert W., land speculator, 179, 184.
- Smith, Samuel A., and 1855-56 speakership contest, 201.
- Smith, Samuel S., mentioned, 18.
- Smith, William R., supports homestead bills, 312.
- Smithson, William T., banking house, speculation in land, 164, 179.
- Social life, in frontier Tenn., 19 ff.; in ante-bellum La., 433 ff.
- Social Science Research Council, grant-in-aid appointments, 574.
- Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, in S. C., 479-500.
- Sonne, Niels H., *Liberal Ky.*, revd., 393-94.
- Soule, Pierre, and Ostend Manifesto, 373 ff.
- "South and Northern Democratic Congressional Leaders during Reconstruction and After," by Albert V. House, Jr., synop., 67-68.
- South Carolina, preservation of hist'l records, 6, 8; Reconstruction, 50; Ger.-Swiss emigrants in, 83-97; pol. and jud. hist., 120-21; capital, invested in No. lands, 156 ff.; Slater fund work, 238 ff.; emigration from, 300 ff.; internal improvements, 395-96; frontier, as seen by missionaries, 479-500.
- Southern Biography Series, announced, 128.
- "Southern Designs on Cuba, 1854-1857, and Some European Opinions," ed. by Gavin B. Henderson, 371-85.
- Southern Historical Association, fourth ann. meeting, 62-75; committees appointed, 123; to participate in Miss. Valley Hist'l meeting, 123-24; joint session with American Hist'l Assoc., 126.

- "Southern Investments in Northern Lands before the Civil War," by Paul W. Gates, 155-85.
- Spain, diplomacy, 119-20; Cuban annexation and, 374 ff.
- Spanish, S. P. G. relig. work among, 491-92.
- Specie Circular, Jackson's, effect on land speculation, 168-69.
- Spence, H. E., revs. Gobbel's *Church-State Relationship in Educ. in N. C.*, 272-73.
- Spiller, Mrs. Wood, mentioned, 79.
- Sports, ante-bellum La., 433 ff.
- Spruill, Julia C., *Women's Life and Work in the So. Cols.*, revd., 254-55.
- Squatter sovereignty, a Canadian view, 247; Douglas' interpretation, 539 ff.
- Squatters, Tenn. land laws and, 25 ff.
- Stanley, Augustus O., supports farmers' organizations, 352.
- Starling, Lyne, "loan shark," 157.
- State rights, a Canadian view, 249; Berrien and, 465-67; Ware and, 501 ff.; Douglas' views on, 530 ff.
- Steele, Franklin, land speculator, 175.
- Steffan, Mr. and Mrs. George, assist in trans. of Tobler MSS., 84.
- Stephens, Alexander H., and 1855-56 speakership election, 189 ff.; and Whig policy, 537.
- Stephens, Ruth, mentioned, 125.
- Stephenson, Wendell H., mentioned, 76, 128, 276; *Isaac Franklin*, revd., 109-10; co-ed. Hist. of the So., 278.
- Stern, Philip V. D., *Man Who Killed Lincoln*, revd., 401-402.
- Stevens, Robert, S. P. G. missionary, 483 ff.
- Stevenson, Andrew, mentioned, 197.
- Stokes, William B., land speculator, 170, 179, 183.
- Stone, Alfred H., revs., Stephenson's *Isaac Franklin*, 109-10.
- Stone, W. J., Ky. gov. candidate, 37, 42.
- Strateman, Katherine, mentioned, 412.
- Stroupe, Henry S., mentioned, 574.
- Stuart, A. H. H., and Negro educ., 224.
- Sugar industry, La., 63-64; effects of Civil War on, 315-32.
- "Sugar Nabobs," identified, 317.
- Summersell, Charles G., mentioned, 276.
- Sumner, Charles, assaulted by Brooks, 206; criticized by Douglas, 531.
- "Survey of Historic Sites in the South," by Roy E. Appleman, synop., 65.
- Swann, Thomas, land speculator, 168.
- Swartwout, Samuel, mentioned, 165.
- Swearingen, Mack, mentioned, 76, 125; revs. Carter's (comp. and ed.) *Territorial Papers of U. S.*, VI, 108-109; revs. Capers' *Biog. of a River Town*, 554-55.
- Sweeny, Rittenhouse, and Fant, dealers in land warrants, 164.
- Swint, Henry L., mentioned, 412.
- Swiss, German, emigrants to S. C., 83-97.
- Sydnor, Charles S., mentioned, 78, 124, 278; *Benjamin L. C. Wailes*, revd., 114-15; revs. Newsome's *Pres. Election of 1824 in N. C.*, 396-97; "Theory and Practice of Geology in the So.," synop., 70-71.
- Tabb, Philip M., invests in No. lands, 157-58.
- Talman, James J. (ed.), "A Canadian View of Parties and Issues on the Eve of the Civil War," 245-53.
- Taney, Roger B., and Jackson adm., 455 ff.
- Tariff, Berrien's attitude toward, 449 ff.; and Ga. politics, 464-68.
- Tate, Vernon D., mentioned, 413.
- Tax, excise, and sugar industry, 321 ff.
- Taylor, Rosser H. (co-ed.), *Memoirs of Richard Cannon Watts*, revd., 120-21.
- Taylor, William, S. P. G. secy., 492 ff.
- Taylor, William S., Rep. candidate for Ky. gov., 43 ff.; dispute over election, 45-46.
- Teche, sugar planting on, 315 ff.
- Temperance societies, Tenn. Baptists and, 30.
- Tenant-farmers, and tobacco wars, 348 ff.
- Tennessee, archive authority, 12; culture vs. frontier, 18-33; slave insurrection panic, 209-15, 222; Slater fund work, 232 ff.; Lindsley's work in, 261-62; emigration from, 300 ff.; and Indian question, 447; financial scandal, 570-71.
- Terhune, Thornton, mentioned, 126.
- Territorial Papers of the United States*, VI, *The Territory of Mississippi, 1809-1817*, comp. & ed. by Clarence E. Carter, revd., 108-109.
- Territories, Douglas' view conc., 531 ff.
- Texas, preservation of hist'l records, 6; slave insurrection panic in, 207-209; Slater fund work, 228, 238 ff.; and Turner thesis, 302 ff.; La. planters' interest in, 444; annexation, Douglas' views, 534.
- 35,000 Days in Texas: A History of the Dallas News and Its Forbears*, by Sam Acheson, revd., 270-72.
- Thomas, Dan H., mentioned, 276.
- Thomas, Samuel, S. P. G. missionary, 486 ff.
- Thomas Clarkson: The Friend of Slaves*, by Earl Leslie Griggs, revd., 392-93.
- Thompson, Holland, revs., Crowell's *Personal Recollections*, 405-407.
- Thompson, Thomas, S. P. G. missionary, 497.
- Thurman, Allen G., mentioned, 68.
- Tift, Solomon, land speculator, 177.
- Tillman, Ben, views on Reconstruction, 50.

- Tobacco industry, Am. Soc. of Equity and, 347-63.
- Tobler, John, account of emigration to S. C., 83-98.
- Tobler, Ulric, identified, 95.
- Toombs, Robert, land speculator, 182; mentioned, 528.
- Townes, John E., mentioned, 125.
- Trexler, H. A., revs. McCordock's *Yankee Cheese Box*, 117-18; revs. James' *George W. Truett*, 410.
- Trinity College, study of development, 405-407.
- Troup, George M., and Jackson adm., 452 ff.
- Truett, George W., biog., revd., 410.
- Trumbull, Lyman, and land speculators, 181-82.
- Tulane University, host to So. Hist'l Assoc., 72.
- Turner, Frederick J., mentioned, 153-54; early writings and bibliog., revd., 387-89; Phillips and, 370; thesis discussed, 65; hist. interpretation, and South, 291-314.
- Turner, Nat, slave insurrection, 206. "Turner Theories" and the South," by Avery Craven, 291-314.
- Tyler, John, political policies, 397-98.
- "Ulrich Bonnell Phillips: Historian of the South," by Fred Landon, 364-71.
- University of Nashville, Lindsley and, 23 ff.
- Van Buren, Martin, and Jackson adm., 447 ff.
- Van Deusen, John G., *Black Man in White America*, revd., 565-66.
- Vance, Rupert B., revs. Gallagher's *American Caste and the Negro College*, 273-74; mentioned, 278.
- Vardaman, James K., mentioned, 50.
- Varnod, Francis, S. P. G. missionary, 481 ff.
- Varnton, H. W., land speculator, 179.
- Venable, A. S., mentioned, 413.
- Vesey, Denmark, slave insurrection leader, 206.
- Viles, Jonas, mentioned, 413.
- Virginia, preservation of hist'l records, 5 ff.; dept. of archives and hist., 12; frontier hist., 103-104; Hist'l Records Survey work, 131; capital, invested in No. lands, 156 ff.; slave insurrection plots, 219-21; col. justice in, 255-57; origin of settlers, 257-58; emigration from, 300 ff.; hist'l influences, 334 ff.; early cities, 390-92.
- Virginia Historical Society, acquisitions, 282, 575.
- Wailes, B. L. C., biography revd., 114-15.
- Waite, Morrison R., Peabody Trustee, 224.
- Walden, Lord Howard de, and Cuban annexation question, 379.
- Walker, Burnis, mentioned, 413.
- Walker, Robert J., and land speculations, 164-66, 174, 177, 307-308.
- Walkley, Seldon S., speculates in No. lands, 172.
- Wallace, David A., S. C. map comp., 281.
- Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures, given by Herbert A. Kellar, 275.
- Ward, Judson C., mentioned, 125, 412.
- Ware, Catherine Ann, writer, identified, 504-505.
- Ware, Nathaniel A., nat. economist, career and writings, 501-26.
- Washington, Booker T., and Slater fund work, 241.
- Washington, George, and Va. frontier hist., 104.
- Washington, L. Q., mentioned, 474.
- Watson, Richard L., Jr., mentioned, 574.
- Watson, Tom, mentioned, 50.
- Watterson, Henry, and Ky. politics, 39-40.
- Watts, Richard Cannon, memoirs, revd., 120-21.
- Webb, Walter P., and Yankee exploitation, 339.
- Webster, Daniel, and Whigs, 537.
- Weed, Thurlow, mentioned, 188; and 1855-56 speakership contest, 204-205; abolitionist, 221.
- Weld, Theodore Dwight, mentioned, 366.
- Wells, William C., precursor of Darwin, 338.
- Wertenbaker, Thomas J., and cavalier tradition, 338-39.
- West, C. P., mentioned, 125.
- West Virginia, preservation of hist'l records, 12-13.
- Wharton, Vernon L., mentioned, 412.
- Whigs, and 1855-56 speakership election, 187 ff.; Ware as economist of, 503 ff.
- White, Elias, land speculator, 161, 180 ff.
- White, Hugh L., and Jackson adm., 448 ff.
- White, Miles, land speculator, 160-61, 185. *Wider Horizons of American History*, by Herbert E. Bolton, revd., 563-64.
- Wienefield, R. H., mentioned, 126, 276.
- Wiley, B. I., "The Impact of Fed. Invasion on the Institution of Slavery," synop., 67; mentioned, 279; revs. Van Deusen's *Black Man in White Am.*, 565-66.
- Williams, Amelia W. (co-ed.), *Writings of Sam Houston*, revd., 259-61.
- Williams, Wirt A., mentioned, 279.
- Williamsburg Art of Cookery, by Helen Bullock, noted, 280.

- Willson, Augustus E., and tobacco wars, 357 ff.
Wilmot Proviso, issue in speakership contest, 198-99.
Wilson, William, and Sons, speculate in No. lands, 159-60.
Windom, William, and So. land speculators, 182.
Windrow, John E., *John Berrien Lindsley*, revd., 261-62.
Winkler, E. W., rpts. on Tex. hist'l agencies, 73.
Winton, George B., mentioned, 78.
Wisconsin, land speculation in, 156 ff.
Wise, Henry, arrests Negroes, 220; mentioned, 470, 473.
Wish, Harvey, "The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1856," 206-22; *George Fitzhugh*, noted, 279; revs. Carroll's *Slave Insurrections in the U. S.*, 265-66.
Wittke, Carl, revs. Clark's *Rampaging Frontier*, 398-99.
Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies, by Julia C. Spruill, revd., 254-55.
Woodbury, Levi, mentioned, 455.
Woodward, C. Vann, mentioned, 278; revs., Davidson's *Child Labor Legislation*, 407-408.
Woody, R. H., revs. Horn's *Invisible Empire*, 402-404.
Wright, Irene A., mentioned, 414.
Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863, ed. by Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker, revd., 259-61.
Wysor, William Wirt, life and letters, 119-20.
Yamassee, relig. work among, 480 ff.
Yancey, William L., and 1860 election, 527, 528, 551.
Yankee, exploitation by, and So. development, 339.
Yankee Cheese Box, by Robert S. McCordock, revd., 117-18.
Zollicoffer, Felix K., pro-Neb. Am., 190 ff.
Zueblin (Zubly), David, identified, 96.